

**Application Number:** 21/00999/OUTEIS

- Proposal:** Hybrid planning application encompassing: (i) outline element (with all matters reserved) for a large-scale mixed-use urban extension (creating a new community) comprising: residential development; employment including business, general industry and storage/distribution uses; a secondary school and primary schools; a community hub containing a range of commercial and community uses; a new linear park along the River Ouzel corridor; open space and linked amenities; new redways, access roads and associated highways improvements; associated infrastructure works; demolition of existing structures and (ii) detailed element for strategic highway and multi-modal transport infrastructure, including: new road and redway extensions; a new bridge over the M1 motorway; a new bridge over the River Ouzel; works to the Tongwell Street corridor between Tongwell roundabout and Pineham roundabout including new bridge over the River Ouzel; alignment alterations to A509 and Newport Road; and associated utilities, earthworks and drainage works **at** Milton Keynes East, Land East And West of A509 London Road, Newport Pagnell, MK16 0JA
- Applicant:** St James Group Ltd
- Application type:** Hybrid (part outline application, part full application)
- Ward:** Olney/Newport Pagnell South Ward/Broughton Ward
- Parish:** Moulsoe Parish Council/Newport Town Parish Council/Campbell Park Parish Council/Broughton and Milton Keynes Parish Council/Great Linford Parish Council
- Statutory Target:** 21.07.2021 **Extension of Time:** Yes – 07.12.2021
- Case Officer:** Elizabeth Verdegem  
Team Leader (West) – Development Management  
elizabeth.verdegem@milton-keynes.gov.uk
- Team Manager:** Chris Nash  
Development Management Manager  
chris.nash@milton-keynes.gov.uk

## Preface

In addition to the Glossary of Terms provided earlier in the agenda, the following abbreviations are used throughout this particular report:

ALC	Agricultural Land Classification
AW	Anglian Water
CBC	Central Bedfordshire Council
DRT	Demand Responsive Transport
HIF	Housing Infrastructure Fund
HWRC	Household Waste Recycling Centre
IDB	Internal Drainage Board
J13/J14	Junction 13/14 (of the M1 motorway)
LEMP	Landscape Ecological Management Plan
MKE	Milton Keynes East (Allocation)
MKEDF	Milton Keynes East Development Framework
MRT	Mass Rapid Transport
PPS	Playing Pitch Strategy
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment

### 1.0 Recommendation

- 1.1 Subject to the completion of a section 106 (S106) agreement securing the obligations and terms set out in this report, permission be **granted** subject to the conditions substantively set out below (as may be supplemented/modified in any accompanying written or verbal update to the Committee), with powers delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chairs of the Committee in respect of the addition and wording of the Great Crested Newt (GCN) District Licence conditions, if they are deemed to be necessary, and for the final wording of and reasons for all conditions.
- 1.2 In the event that the S106 agreement is not completed within 28 days following the Committee's resolution, the Head of Planning be delegated authority to extend the period for completion of the S106 agreement, or, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chairs, refuse permission.

### 2.0 Introduction

- 2.1 The application has been referred to the Committee as it is considered potentially controversial due to its scale and the level of public interest arising and considered to be materially in conflict with the Development Plan in part. It has also been referred to Committee for a decision by Newport Pagnell Town Council.

### **3.0 Background**

#### The site and its context

- 3.1 The application site forms part of the Milton Keynes East (MKE) allocation which is allocated in Plan:MK for the future delivery of a new community of around 5,000 homes, employment, schools, local centres, green infrastructure, public transport infrastructure and other associated infrastructure. MKE is located to the north-east of the M1, south of Newport Pagnell and the A422, and west of Moulsoe. The allocation comprises around 461 hectares of land designated for this new community.
- 3.2 The site itself is 437.46 hectares and makes up around 80% of the MKE allocation, as the remainder of the land is owned by other parties (parcels to the north-west and north-east of the allocation). However, the application site is slightly larger than the allocation, as it extends south of the M1 to include the related highways infrastructure, and east of the allocation by between 60 and 250 metres towards Moulsoe along the eastern perimeter (from Newport Road to the Council owned land at the north-east corner).
- 3.3 The site therefore comprises land bound by the A422/A509 to the north, with Newport Pagnell beyond, and the M1 to the south-west, on land either side of London Road (A509). To the south-east the site extends beyond Newport Road into arable fields. To the west of London Road and the River Ouzel, the site extends up to the M1 to the south-west and up to Willen Road at the south-west corner as it crosses the M1. To the north-west is the remainder of the MKE allocation on land owned by other parties. Land south of the M1 is also included around and along Tongwell Street, between and including the Tongwell and Pineham Roundabouts, as is part of the River Ouzel corridor either side of the M1.
- 3.4 The site is therefore bisected by London Road (A509), and the River Ouzel flows through the western half of the site, with a number of streams/watercourses located off the main river. The area is mostly agricultural land, although it also contains a few clusters of farm buildings. There are three 'gaps' in the location plan, where the Holiday Inn, houses of Pym's Stables, and a small furniture warehouse off Newport Road are not included.
- 3.5 The agricultural land is designated as grade 3 and is mostly arable fields defined by hedgerows. There are small areas of woodland and other vegetation across the site. Most of the site is in Flood Zone 1, with Flood Zones 2 and 3 along the River Ouzel to the west side of the site. A large proportion of the site to the west of London Road is also in a minor aquifer groundwater vulnerability zone.
- 3.6 The River Ouzel and adjacent land buffer form a wildlife corridor, and there is also a wildlife corridor buffer along the M1, and along Broughton Brook. The area is a mixture of green, amber and red risk zones for GCNs. There is a small Local Wildlife Site (LWS) to the east of London Road (approx. 450 metres south of A509). There are no other wildlife designations within the site.

- 3.7 Part of the site, west of the river near the M1, is located within a Minerals Search Area (MSA) for sand & gravel. In addition, the Willen Road Travellers site is located to the west, at the southern point at Willen Road near the M1.
- 3.8 In addition to the Holiday Inn building, which is Grade II listed, there are a further 11 listed buildings within Moulsoe; 10 are Grade II, plus the Grade I Church of St Mary, and one further Grade II listed building at Tickford Park Farm, to the north of Moulsoe. There are also a number of archaeological notification sites within the application site, to the west of London Road.
- 3.9 It should also be noted that to west of the M1, the site boundary falls close to the Willen conservation area, which includes one Grade I, and four Grade II listed buildings. Two areas of Willen to the west of Aldrich Drive are nominated for the New Town Heritage Register. There is a further nomination at Cotton Valley Sewage Works. In addition, there are views of the site from Campbell Park, to the south-west, which is a Grade II registered park and garden.
- 3.10 There are a number of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) within the site, including four footpaths and two bridleways between the site and Newport Pagnell and Moulsoe.

#### The proposal

- 3.11 This is a hybrid application, which means part of the development is proposed in full detail (the highways infrastructure) and part in outline (the remainder of the built form and other ancillary works). It should be noted that the description of the development does not include reference to the exact quantum of each respective use, in order to allow for some flexibility. It is proposed to control the limits of the development through a number of conditions and obligations, including setting minimum and maximum ranges in terms of number of houses, and amount of floorspace for different uses. The applicant has proposed ranges and limits for the quantum of development. These are set out below and have been tested and supported through the Environmental Statement and other supporting documents accompanying the planning application.

#### *Full proposal*

- 3.12 The proposal covered by the full application is for the strategic highways infrastructure. This essentially relates to two new roads, the associated junctions and crossings, and the associated drainage and other works:
- An Eastern Link Grid Road - a new part dual, part single carriageway Grid Road linking Junction 14 (J14) of the M1 to a new junction of the A509 east of Interchange Park. This would follow the eastern boundary of the site and would involve access to the new development parcels. It would also link to a downgraded existing A509 London Road and would involve the existing Newport Road where it joins the A509 being closed to through-traffic. Access

to Moulsoe and beyond towards Cranfield would be provided by linking the existing Newport Road into the new grid roads via a new spur to the south-east, to serve the employment and residential parcels in this part of the site. The Eastern Link would involve a new single span bridge over the Moulsoe Stream.

- A Western Link Grid Road – a new predominantly dual carriageway Grid Road linking the V11 Tongwell Street from the Pineham Roundabout, to the A509/A422 at the Tickford Roundabout. This would include the dualling of the existing Tongwell Street within the existing Grid Road corridor, including a new dual carriageway bridge on Tongwell Street over the River Ouzel, a new dual carriageway bridge over the M1 motorway, and a new dual carriageway bridge over the River Ouzel as the proposed Grid Road passes through the Linear Park. The new dual carriageway bridge across the River Ouzel through the Linear Park would tie into a new roundabout on the A509 London Road, continuing northwards as the existing single carriageway to the Tickford Roundabout.

3.13 The plans have been revised during the course of the application to amend the proposal with regard to Tongwell Street/Carlton Gate to the west of the M1 in Willen. Whilst originally the proposal involved a new roundabout with Carleton Gate, with part of Tongwell Street being reconfigured to one-way; through discussions with consultees and Willen residents, the applicant has amended the plans to retain Tongwell Street as two-way, and instead close the entrance to Willen at Carlton Gate in order to facilitate the junction and crossing of the M1.

3.14 Other small changes have been made during the application process and further supporting information provided, for example drainage calculations.

#### *Outline proposal*

3.15 The outline element of this application is proposed with all matters reserved, and therefore it is only the principle of the proposal that is to be considered.

3.16 The development principally comprises the following:

- around 4,000 (up to a maximum of 4,600) homes including later living accommodation;
- up to 403,650 sqm of employment floorspace;
- three primary schools with early years provision and one secondary school;
- a community hub with up to 10,000 sqm of commercial floorspace, including a health hub (a district centre);
- an additional local centre; and
- open space, including a 63ha linear park along the River Ouzel, a sports field, new woodland, allotments and community orchards and play spaces.

3.17 The applicant has set out the proposed limits for the number of residential units and the different amounts of floorspace within the following table, extracted from the Planning Statement:

Use/ component	Location(s) within site	Use Class & use type	Amount (maximum) and/or parameter sought
Homes	Residential parcels and Community Hub	Use Class C2/C3 – (includes any potential housing with care element)	Up to 4,600 homes (including houses, flats and specialist elderly accommodation with or without care).
Employment	Employment areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zone A: West parcel</li> <li>• Zone B: Centre parcel</li> <li>• Zone C: East parcel</li> </ul> Plus 3 x employment or residential parcels to west of River Ouzel.	Use Class B2/B8 Use Class E (Offices/Light Industrial)	403,650 sqm of which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum 37,160 sqm Class E offices/light industrial (within Zone A)</li> <li>• Maximum 92,900 sqm Class B2 industrial</li> <li>• Maximum 403,650 sqm Class B8 warehousing (with ancillary offices)</li> </ul>
Schools	3 x Primary Schools: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS1: Community Hub</li> <li>• PS2: Central South</li> <li>• PS3: South of Moulsoe</li> </ul> 1 x Secondary School: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SS1: Community Hub</li> </ul>	Use Class F1	PS1: 3 Form of Entry (3.0ha site) PS2: 3 Form of Entry (3.0ha site) PS3: 2 Form of Entry (2.1ha site) SS1: Up to 10 Form of Entry (11.8ha site)
Commercial and Community	Community Hub	Commercial use within Class E/Sui Generis including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shops, restaurants, cafes, services (uses in Class E) and public house, takeaway (uses in Sui Generis class)</li> <li>• Health centre</li> <li>• Early years nursery</li> <li>• Gymnasium</li> </ul>	10,000 sqm Class E/Sui Generis floorspace in the community hub of which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum 4,000 sqm retail, broken down with maximums: - Convenience retail: 1,500 sqm</li> <li>- Comparison retail: 2,000 sqm</li> <li>- Food &amp; beverage: 1,000 sqm</li> <li>- Other non-retail service: 1,000 sqm</li> <li>• Maximum 2,000 sqm health</li> <li>• Maximum 2,000 sqm early years nursery</li> <li>• Maximum 1,000 sqm commercial gym</li> <li>• Maximum 2,000 sqm office use (within maximum parameter of 37,160 sqm offices/light industrial across entire site).</li> </ul>
		Community hall and/or community services within Use Class F1/F2	400 sqm

Use/ component	Location(s) within site	Use Class & use type	Amount (maximum) and/or parameter sought
	South of Moulsoe Local Parade	Use Class E/Sui Generis – shops, restaurants, cafes, services (uses in Class E) and takeaway (Sui Generis)	Maximum of 500 sqm Class E/Sui Generis floorspace, within which a maximum of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convenience retail: 300 sqm</li> <li>• Comparison retail: 200 sqm</li> <li>• Food &amp; beverage: 200 sqm</li> <li>• Other non-retail service: 200 sqm</li> </ul>
	Sports Pitches	Sports pavilion/clubhouse within Use Class F2	600 sqm
	Linear/District Park	Community building/visitor centre within Use Class F2	600 sqm

3.18 The minimum proposed delivery of residential accommodation is summarised below (this table includes all residential, including extra care provision):

	Market		Affordable		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-bed flat	98	3.6%	254	20.5%	352	8.8%
2-bed flat	182	6.6%	170	13.7%	352	8.8%
2-bed house	164	5.9%	380	30.6%	544	13.6%
3-bed house	745	27.0%	357	28.8%	1,102	27.6%
4-bed house	1,023	37.1%	49	3.9%	1,072	26.8%
5-bed house	548	19.9%	30	2.4%	578	14.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,760</b>	<b>69.0%</b>	<b>1,240</b>	<b>31.0%</b>	<b>4,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

3.19 The minimum affordable housing mix by tenure is set out below:

		Affordable rent		Social rent		Shared ownership		Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Flats</b>	1 bed	88	11%	0	0%	38	16%	126	10%
	1 bed extra care	0	0%	128	64%	0	0%	128	10%
	2 bed	80	10%	0	0%	58	24%	138	11%
	2 bed extra care	0	0%	32	16%	0	0%	32	3%
<b>Houses</b>	2 bed	280	35%	0	0%	100	42%	380	31%
	3 bed	313	39%	0	0%	44	18%	357	29%
	4 bed	14	2%	35	18%	0	0%	49	4%
	5 bed	25	3%	5	3%	0	0%	30	2%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1,240</b>	<b>100%</b>

3.20 A set of parameter plans have been submitted with the application, which set out the development areas, the land use, green infrastructure, movement and access, and building heights. These parameter plans outline the broad form of the development,

and combined with appropriate conditions and obligations, would be used to control the development.

- 3.21 The proposal covered by the outline elements of the scheme has been amended during the course of the application in discussion with officers and consultees to amend the housing mix, with further supporting information provided and minor amendments to the parameter plan to reflect other small changes.
- 3.22 An EIA Scoping Opinion was issued 30<sup>th</sup> November 2020 under the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2017, to agree the scope of the Environmental Statement (ES) that would be required with the planning application for the development. The application is therefore accompanied by an ES which covers the following topics:
- Transport;
  - Landscape and Views;
  - Ecology;
  - Air Quality;
  - Noise;
  - Ground Conditions & Soils;
  - Historic Built Environment;
  - Archaeology;
  - Water Environment and Drainage;
  - Socio Economics;
  - Climate Change and Resilience;
  - Waste; and
  - Cumulative Impact.

The ES and its conclusions are considered further in the appraisal below.

#### **4.0 Relevant planning history**

##### **4.1 Pre-application advice**

20/02083/PPA: Hybrid application for the development of approximately 4000 homes, employment land, local centre, secondary school, three primary schools, linear park and associated infrastructure, within the MKE allocation.  
Advice given through meetings with planning officers and consultees at various points throughout 2020 and early 2021.



#### 4.2 Application site

20/02484/EIASCO: EIA Scoping opinion for proposed development to the east of the M1 motorway, south of Newport Pagnell, to provide a sustainable urban extension to Milton Keynes  
Scoping Opinion Issued – 20.11.2020

#### 4.3 Site to the west – land at Caldecote Farm

21/02440/OUTEIS: Outline application (matters of access to be considered with matters of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping reserved) for storage and distribution (Use Class B8) floorspace, with ancillary offices and associated infrastructure, including access, parking, servicing and landscaping.  
Under consideration

19/02402/FUL: Full planning application for the erection of two storage and distribution units (use class B8), with associated access, car parking, servicing, landscaping, earthworks, on and off-site drainage and off-site highway works.  
Refused 30.06.2020 on grounds of principle (in terms of infrastructure delivery), highways (grade separated crossings), residential amenity, landscape character and planning obligations

### 5.0 **Consultations and representations**

All responses and representations received can be viewed in full, online at [www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/publicaccess](http://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/publicaccess) using application ref. 21/00999/OUTEIS. The following paragraphs summarise those responses and representations.

To clarify, this application has been advertised by way of 17 site notices placed within and around the site, a press notice in MK Citizen, and over 3,000 letters sent to all addresses within 0.5 miles/800 metres of the application site, in addition to consultation letters to statutory and non-statutory consultees, as listed below.

#### 5.1 Moulsoe Parish Council

##### *Initial response*

Does not consider the traffic modelling to be credible, particularly at peak hours showing a reduction. Notes severe existing traffic at J14 and considers that the reduction in traffic as a result of the new crossing will not offset the increase in traffic from the new employment and residential areas, and that other developments will also lead to an increase in congestion.

Considers volume of traffic will increase in Moulsoe and that new road infrastructure to take account of the potential future route to Cranfield should be installed now, otherwise the route through Moulsoe will be damaged by HGVs. Considers the road layout linking Newport Road to the single carriageway, then eastern perimeter road, to be a difficult to negotiate layout. Considers the Moulsoe bypass to be essential and should be part of the infrastructure delivered now. Considers the eastern perimeter road should be dualled from the outset.

Concern regarding construction traffic accessing sites via Newport Road, causing damage and debris on the road, and that the road is too narrow. Requests condition so no construction traffic travels through Moulsoe, and that detailed construction and management plan is agreed with the Parish Council, with advanced warning of any road closures that affect Moulsoe.

Considers the development should be re-evaluated as the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway is no longer going ahead, and that housing growth relied heavily on this infrastructure. Considers MRT should not form part of this application as it is not funded, and therefore there is no clarity regarding reducing car use, or whether sufficient car parking is provided. Considers that plans should not encourage future expansion beyond MKE.

Considers the road layout at the new junction with Newport Road to the single carriageway to be a safety risk, replicating the junction between the A509 and Newport Road (just north of J14) before it was amended with left turn only and yellow hatching. Considers that Newport Road should join directly to the roundabout on the eastern perimeter road. Concern that new junctions at the A509 will create bottle necks and that traffic will not be reduced.

Considers the landscape buffer at Pym's Stables to be inadequate, with concern that existing residents will not be adequately protected from noise and traffic.

Considers all new junction improvement works should be delivered prior to development. Concern that layout will generate a rat-run through Willen, and that the data used is not up to date. Queries why HIF funded infrastructure is dual carriageway, while developer funded infrastructure is single-carriageway.

Concern regarding grade separated crossing being provided across the A422 and A509, in the locations and standards specified in the MKEDF. Concern that no pedestrian/cycle link is provided to Moulsoe, and considers redways should be segregated and meet design standards. Concern that pedestrian/cycle crossing of M1 at J14 has not been provided. Cycles should have more priority at junctions, and links should be extended to the site boundaries.

Considers previous comments at HIF bid and MKEDF consultation have not been implemented. Considers development to be unambitious in its carbon reduction targets, with further consideration needed for a community energy network, and

queries whether proposed air source heat pumps will be required by condition. Query the provision of materials for earthworks, and how these will reach the site.

Notes IDB objection and requirement for their consent, and query if plans show all IDB watercourses. Considers the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) to be unacceptable reiterating comments from the Environment Agency (EA). Considers additional run-off from hard surfacing the development will exacerbate existing flood conditions, including existing risk to Newport Pagnell, and have concerns regarding water pollution and impacts on ecology and species. Queries biodiversity net gain claims and query if Defra environmental schemes have been factored into calculation. Repeats EA comments regarding water stress in the area. Notes potential impact on GCN as a material planning consideration and need for a GCN licence.

Concern that the linear park will not be fully delivered, due to land ownership issues, and considers applicant should acquire land for linear park delivery and the crossing of the A422, or that the Council should consider using compulsory purchase powers. Query future land ownership and management.

Considers office space unnecessary, as it is not currently needed. Notes potential impact on Ousedale School because of later delivery of the secondary school. Queries need for employment floorspace, and that vacant sites in the city boundary could accommodate development, and plans for population should be reduced.

#### *Revised response*

Considers a weight limit is required for roads through Moulsoe to protect from construction traffic and future development. Considers the eastern perimeter road should be dualled now, as it will be more inconvenient to construct later. Considers the southern spur of this road should be removed as it would lead to future development within the countryside. Considers sports facilities should be progressively phased as other facilities are available, but open space should be available straight away.

## 5.2 Newport Pagnell Town Council

#### *Initial response*

Concern that piecemeal approach by will fail to deliver important infrastructure elements including the linear park, grade separated redway links across A422/A509 and new grid roads and continuation of redway. Notes that sections of eastern and western grid roads funded by development are single carriageways, and that eastern perimeter road and new grid roads should be dual carriageways. Notes that redways should continue to site boundaries and beyond.

Notes Newport Pagnell will act as sustainable town for the development, providing facilities that the development does not provide for itself. Concerns regarding impact of the community hub on vitality and viability of Newport Pagnell High Street.

Concerns over viability of uses proposed and impact on Ousedale School due to later phase delivery of secondary school.

Considers development unambitious in carbon reduction targets, as it only meets minimum targets and it is not in line with the Council's carbon neutral targets and national targets.

Overall, considers proposal to be well thought through, which should deliver a high quality development, but reiterates the concern for the lack of comprehensive plan across MKE.

*Revised response*

Broadly agrees with the development plan, objects and requests the decision is made at DCC. Considers dualling of new grid roads to be necessary from the outset. Requests removal of cycle path and toucan crossing across the bridge at the M1, as it would create a pinch point at the Willen Road crossing of M1. Requests lighting measures to be confirmed for redways, and all to be grade separated crossings of A509/A422. Considers that all formal sports grounds should be provided at Willen Road Sports Ground, north of A422, and land used for allotments or social housing, as pavilion and formal pitch will require maintenance and formal sport should be consolidated in the existing facility.

5.3 Great Linford Parish Council

*Initial response*

Considers that the application should be deferred until a comprehensive development framework and traffic study has been prepared, taking into account all applications at MKE. Considers that the outline element, leaving reserved matters or later decision, contravenes the masterplanning requirement of policy SD12. Considers the commercial and community elements should be tested to avoid duplication with Great Linford and Newport Pagnell. Requests clarification as to whether the layout character and design can be considered under this application.

Considers the highways proposals need consideration regarding commuter traffic from a wider area than MKE, to include Olney, Bedford, Cranfield and Marston Vale. Considers the proposal unclear regarding capacity of Tongwell Street, and the Tongwell and Pineham roundabouts. Concern regarding traffic and travel interruption during construction. Considers the proposal premature without progress on the plans for MRT. Concern about existing residents and impacts from additional highways traffic. Requests assurances that there is capacity for foul water and surface water run-off to not affect River Ouzel and Willen Lake. Considers identified roundabouts for improvements are already up to capacity, and that all road improvements should be implemented prior to the development.

*Revised response*

Cautiously welcomes the amendments, but repeats request for study of traffic in light of the change in proposals and with other applications at MKE coming forward.

*[Note: additional comments in response relate to other applications at MKE].*

5.4 Campbell Park Parish Council

*Initial response*

Objects to highways plans. Consultation with residents shows clear objection to the closure of Tongwell Street to southbound traffic, the bridge across the M1 and the roundabout at Carlton Gate, with concerns about traffic, rat-running through Willen, noise and pollution. Concern with the number and size of plans submitted, and concern with how up to date the highways data is. Concern that comments given during previous consultation (in relation to HIF bid) have not been taken into account.

*Revised response*

Supports the amended proposal involving the closure of Carlton Gate, with survey of residents showing majority were in support of this amendment.

5.5 Broughton and Milton Keynes Parish Council

No comments received.

5.6 Sherington Parish Council

Considers that a comprehensive masterplan for the whole of MKE should be put in place before the applications are submitted. Concern regarding who will manage the land, under what ownership. Considers infrastructure before expansion to be imperative, with concern that the highways infrastructure will not be in place early enough to avoid disruption, notes concern about increased use of roads through surrounding villages, and seeks assurances roads won't be used for construction traffic. Queries whether studies have been done to assess noise and air pollution. Concern regarding localised flooding, and requests this issue is resolved before construction begins.

Generally supportive, noting increased populace will support local schools and community uses, but emphasises need for infrastructure to be in place early, so as not to increase pressure on existing services in the area.

5.7 North Crawley Parish Council

Does not object to development itself, but has significant concern regarding traffic implications to the village. Considers that unless layout and signage changes, traffic

will use North Crawley as a route between J14 and Cranfield, via new eastern perimeter road, instead of through Moulsoe as it currently does, which would be a shorter but potentially no faster route. Understands potential for future Moulsoe bypass from J14 to Cranfield, but no timescales for this project.

Increase in traffic would be a safety concern though the village, particularly in relating to the school and nursery, and potential damage to older buildings.

Requests that the Moulsoe bypass is brought forward at the same time as the eastern perimeter road or that the existing route to Cranfield is not changed, and still encouraged through Moulsoe. Also requests no construction traffic to be routed through North Crawley.

#### 5.8 Hulcote & Salford Parish Council

*Note: comments made on behalf of Cranfield Parish Council and Hulcote & Salford Parish Council together with Central Bedfordshire Ward Councillors Sue Clark, Ken Matthews and Robert Morris.*

Raises concern about the impact of this development on the highway network to, from and within Cranfield and Hulcote & Salford villages, citing earlier responses on the consultation on the MKEDF. Considers that this detailed assessment has not been undertaken.

Concern of existing rat-running through Hulcote & Salford between J13 and J14 being exacerbated by the development, including HGVs. Concern regarding predicted increase in traffic movement of HGVs, and the increase in traffic through Cranfield, and the general increase in traffic leading to pollution and safety issues. Queries how traffic flowing from Milton Keynes may use the route through Brooklands to Salford & Hulcote. Notes the Marston Valley development of 5,000 houses needing to be taken into account. Agrees with comments that the impacts on Cranfield should be further assessed and raises concern that this has not been done.

Queries the safeguarding route for the potential MRT extensions to Cranfield, requesting consultation on future proposals.

#### 5.9 Councillor Douglas McCall (Newport Pagnell South Ward)

*Note: consulted during the first consultation period only due to local elections. Comments made on behalf of Cllrs McCall, Carr and Alexander.*

Notes that development east of the M1 is allocated in Plan:MK and therefore recognises that there can be no objection in principle to the development. Considers that the principle of infrastructure before expansion should be followed, the highways and community infrastructure being essential, and the maximum should be delivered up front. Expresses concern about the risk of flooding downstream in Newport Pagnell and considers the local planning authority (LPA) should be convinced that measures in

place will ensure no flooding within, downstream or elsewhere from the development. Considers that early contact should be made to ensure timely provision of on-site health facilities, as there is already pressure for health facilities in the area.

5.10 Councillor Jane Carr (Newport Pagnell South Ward)

Comments received as above

5.11 Councillor Paul Alexander (Newport Pagnell South Ward)

Comments received as above.

5.12 Councillor Scot Balazs (Newport Pagnell South Ward)

*Note: consulted during the second consultation period only due to local elections.*

No comments received.

5.13 Councillor Keith McLean (Olney Ward) (Member of DCC)

No comments received.

5.14 Councillor David Hosking (Olney Ward)

*Note: comments on behalf of Cllr Hosking and Cllr Peter Geary*

Objects to the application as considers it will reduce the quality of life for existing residents and that the proposal is contrary to national policies to protect the rural countryside. Also considers that the proposal is contrary to the NPPF in regard to flooding and highways impacts.

5.15 Councillor Peter Geary (Olney Ward)

Comments received as above.

5.16 Councillor Sam Crooks (Broughton Ward)

Comments relate to road configurations within Broughton Ward. Notes that a strategic review of the whole road network would have been preferred, but not possible due to Highway England's position on modifications to J14. Accepts the need and position for new bridge, and suitability for the future Mass Rapid Transport (MRT) rather than other locations. Supports dualling of V11 Tongwell Street given the planned use of lanes to be earmarked for MK Connect, electric vehicles and cars with more than one occupant, noting that this cannot be conditioned but that the applicant should be encouraged to explore design (colour) of those lanes, highlighting commitment to carbon reduction.

Welcomes the revised plans to retain Tongwell Street as dualled, with the alternative considered not appealing to residents. Strongly supports a new redway from Tongwell roundabout to the Coachway. Requests all reasonable endeavours to negotiate land ownership agreements for a dedicated cycle/pedestrian crossing of the M1 south of J14.

Acknowledges the divided opinions regarding the closure of Carlton Gate in the revised proposals. Notes it will avoid rat-runs through Willen, but that residents to the south will now have to drive to exit to the north of the estate at Millington Gate. Notes the Parish Council survey and clear majority in favour of the closure. Suggest that pressure on the Millington Gate exit could be eased via traffic lights and that Council money safeguarded for road safety measures to mitigate the impact on Willen from MKE could resolve this, if justified and supported by residents.

Requests acoustic fence along Tongwell Street to mitigate noise from dualling during construction and operation.

5.17 Councillor Kerrie Bradburn (Broughton Ward)

No comments received.

5.18 Councillor John Bint (Broughton Ward)

*Note: consulted during the first consultation period only due to local elections.*

No comments received.

5.19 Councillor Uroy Clarke (Broughton Ward)

*Note: consulted during the second consultation period only due to local elections.*

No comments received.

5.20 MKC Development Plans (Planning Policy)

*Initial response*

Notes the relevant policies in Plan:MK, in particular policy SD12 and the Milton Keynes East Development Framework (MKEDF) and supporting paragraphs in the NPPF, and other SPDs in relation to the proposal noting that majority of the site (within the Moulsoe Parish area) does not have neighbourhood plan.

Considers the key requirements of Policy SD12 have been met, in relation to Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) funding, adoption of MKEDF and applicant's agreement to the Tariff, and quantum of development. Notes the need to consider whether extension of site into the Open Countryside (policy DS5) is appropriate.



Supports, in relation to policy ER10, that retail use is specifically planned for MKE and the proposed limiting condition to prevent floorspace occupation before homes are occupied to reduce impact on Newport Pagnell. Suggests justification is required for the lack of hotel provision (policies SD12 and ER16). Suggests condition required to ensure class E use in employment areas cannot be converted into retail or restaurants, raising concern regarding the creation of out of town retail centres could undermine existing town centres.

In relation to housing mix, acknowledges the precise mix to be determined phase by phase, but notes the overprovision of flats compared to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Notes the supporting text to policy HN1 that states the SHMA should not be applied prescriptively, with other site-specific factors influencing specific need, and the applicant's statement that more flats are required to deliver the number of units required, to increase density and support the delivery of MRT. Therefore, does not object based on divergence from the SHMA, but will require justification through each reserved matters application. Supports suggested conditions from the Housing Team relating to accommodation schedule/plan for each phase. Notes the size mix in affordable housing and the need for more larger homes, through supporting the delivery of affordable housing linked to market homes, and the extra care facility (policies HN2 and HN3), and supports seeking the views of the Housing Team. Recommends securing accessibility standards by condition (Policy HN4). Queries details regarding the provision of land for self-build homes.

Notes the transport policies in Plan:MK and requirement to secure EV charging and broadband access by condition. Queries whether assessment under policy CT7, transport assessment for freight movements is required. Notes the need to ensure power cables and associated infrastructure is placed underground.

Considers that appropriate provision for schools has been met and notes the health hub provision and provision of a Health Impact Assessment for comment by public health colleagues. Notes the potential need to consider the location of hot food takeaways in the community hub, in relation to the schools (policy EH8).

Notes comments received regarding flood risk, conservation and sustainable construction from other consultees.

Notes requirement for tariff agreement in relation to Planning Obligations SPD, as well as provision of burial grounds and community facilities.

Considers that further assessment against policy for Minerals Safeguarding Area (Policy 18 in Minerals Local Plan) is required.

Queries location of proposed Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) and places of worship, as required by MKEDF. Notes the need for Transport Policy to comment on proposed safeguarded area for MRT.

### *Revised response*

Considers some initial queries addressed, but issues regarding Minerals Safeguarding Area and overhead power lines considered to be outstanding. No further comments on MRT route safeguarding. No objection to the applicant not providing a hotel due to the presence of Holiday Inn (as justified in the applicant's revised submission). Raises query regarding location of the HWRC. Agrees that self-build housing could come forward through design code and reserved matters phases. Notes change in affordable housing mix to provide more larger properties. Notes the clarification the places of worship could come forward within community floorspace at the hub, and that policy allows for places of worship to come forward in employment areas, subject to criteria.

Considers conditions for housing mix/tenure and phased delivery of retail should be secured, as well as a condition to avoid class E office and light industrial units to be converted into other class E uses such as shops and restaurants.

## 5.21 MKC Highways

### *Initial response - general highways comments*

Notes that much of the HIF bid infrastructure was discussed and agreed in principle at pre-application stages. Notes downgrading of Tongwell Street to not be ideal, but discussed at pre-app stages to find acceptable solution. Raises queries regarding precisely what is included in the detailed element of the scheme and what off-site works are proposed. Raises concern regarding lack of connections to Newport Pagnell, and connection to southern section of the site. Considers further information is required to how connections link up to existing routes to the north, and the timeframes for crossings to be provided. Raises concern with lack of pedestrian/cycle crossing at J14.

Notes the continued importance of the A509 as a local link, and required setbacks and redway provision along this route. Requests further information on detailed highways drawings regarding junctions and road works, agreeing bus stop and street light locations, and details of noise barriers. Detailed comments provided regarding junction radii, verge and redway widths and visibility.

### *Initial response - Transport Assessment (TA) comments*

Notes the whole of MKE allocation has been included to cumulatively assess impact, and the 15% uplift in housing numbers to account for variability. In relation to existing conditions, notes no accident trends that the development would exacerbate. Considers that maximum walking distances (to reach services, etc.) should be 2km rather than 2 miles, and 5km rather than 5 miles for cycling. Notes the main layout has been established through the modelling in relation to the work on the MKEDF and HIF bid.

Notes the proposed closure of southbound Tongwell Street and therefore concern regarding rat running through Willen. Notes applicant's justification of alternate routes and that access to Willen could be restricted to estate access only, and whilst these are accepted further monitoring work could be secured to ensure issues don't arise.

Notes final consideration of parking to be at the reserved matters stage and applicant's intention to meet parking standards in initial phases, with consideration of the Council's mobility strategy in relation to car ownership in later stages, noting parking standards should reflect this. Notes the need for flexibility as development build-out is 25 years.

Notes that modelling has been conducted based on pre-application discussions, taking into account the effect of other planned development with and without MKE, assessing the impact at junctions within the grid road network, and J13 and J14 of the M1. Agrees the modelling methodology and junctions affected, and the junctions that are at or approaching peak capacity as existing (the Pagoda, Marsh End and Fox Milne roundabouts).

Agrees with the findings that there is general increase in traffic, but redistribution due to new infrastructure will lead to some junctions experiencing a reduction. Considers that, overall, the new infrastructure will fulfil its function. Agrees with the analysis of junctions requiring mitigation, noting most junctions would be over capacity without MKE, some requiring improvement post 2031 in any event. Notes that Newport Pagnell junctions would experience no material impacts, and that junctions within the new infrastructure would be operating within capacity. Notes the conclusions regarding the M1 junctions, for Highways England's comments, but that modelling shows any increase in flow is offset by new infrastructure.

Notes the proposed junction improvements and assessment which shows the proposed mitigation to show junction performance as good as or better than the 'do nothing' scenario, though noting some junctions will still be over capacity. Notes likely need for J14 to be included in strategic improvements package for growth beyond 2031. Additionally, that the roundabout at A509/eastern permitted road would be significantly over capacity in 2048, but that over engineering the junction now could prejudice MRT and further mitigation has been identified that can address the capacity issue should it arise.

Supports package of measures for off-site works to mitigate the direct impacts of MKE but notes the need for further discussions regarding contributions and delivery. Supports lengths of dual carriageways as justified by flows and that early delivery of these would support early delivery of MRT.

*Revised response – general highways comments*

Confirms no objection. Notes that offsite works will be delivered through the tariff contributions, allowing flexibility, though leaving a level of uncertainty to know what

improvements will take place and when. Ultimately considers this is acceptable given discussions with the officer responsible for infrastructure delivery.

Notes concern regarding connections to Newport Pagnell and south to J14 raised by other consultees, and amendments made to address previous highways comments, though expressing concern regarding delivery. Notes the outstanding uncertainty regarding the A509/A422 crossing and issues to resolve, including land ownership. Considers that delivery of these connections can be resolved through S106 agreement.

Notes minor amendments to general arrangement drawings that can be resolved through s278 consent. Considers the changes to the Tongwell Street/Carlton Gate to be acceptable.

Suggests clauses to the S106, as above, and assumption that reserved matters will be subject to design codes. Suggests conditions for final design layout of the infrastructure works, and a construction management plan.

*Revised response – Transport Assessment (TA) comments*

Notes the amendments to Carlton Gate/Tongwell Street, and new modelling that has been produced for the TA addendum. Supports the main conclusions that no further mitigation is required, and therefore no highways objection to the TA.

5.22 MKC Transport Policy

*Passenger Transport*

Notes the need to provide a core route for bus services that is safeguarded when commercial routes are viable. Supports the extension of Demand Rapid Transit (DRT) service but does not support a separate DRT for the area, nor assumption that existing commercial routes can be co-opted into the development. S106 contributions will support a commercial service and flexible delivery as the area grows.

*MRT and Park & Ride*

Supports safeguarding of MRT route, for flexibility in the future provision to serve park & ride and Cranfield, sharing of grid road for efficient use of space which serves denser development located near transport hubs. Notes the most likely scenario being the reallocation of dualled carriageway in both directions, and integration with the primary street which will require careful design to avoid congestion/parking that would cause delays. Some concerns therefore raised regarding drop-off pick-up times at the schools, and the need to avoid congestion on the MRT route. Considers there to be flexibility in the safeguarding to provide back-up options for the route to the park and ride if not along the primary street. Supports safeguarding of land for park and ride to the north-east of the site.

## *Cycling*

Expects walking and cycling infrastructure to be delivered to meet connectivity and access requirements in the MKEDF, specifically over the A422/A509 and across the M1 near J14. Considers these connections are not entirely clear on the plans, and further information is required regarding connections to Newport Pagnell and south of the site. Considers that a safeguarded route across the M1 should be provided, such as a dedicated bridge or through the intersection of J14, and that funding should be safeguarded for this route. Suggests extending the V11 super route to the north to join the H4 super route at Tongwell roundabout, to provide connections to Tongwell Industrial Estate and CMK.

Proposals should adhere to design manuals, supporting cycling segregation from motor vehicles and be designed for significant numbers of users, to be accessible and inclusive of different types of bikes, wheelchairs or mobility scooters. Notes that some links merge from redways, to footpaths and leisure routes, but that cycle routes should be continuous. Notes that busy routes should have redways wider than 3 metres with a segregation line; primary routes should be minimum 5 metres, and secondary routes minimum 3 metres.

## *Travel Plan*

Broadly supportive of outline work and residential Travel Plans. Individual Travel Plans should be submitted following occupation of each land use that meets the threshold. Sets out key requirements for Travel Plan submission, including details regarding targets, monitoring and review, and that securing funding should be through the S106 (via funding in addition to the tariff).

### 5.23 MKC Rights of Way

Notes the presence of four public footpaths and two bridleways. Supports the proposed realignment along green corridors and grid road green buffers, and not directly alongside roads, in accordance with guidance, as well as separate from redways. Notes the process required to divert rights of way and that this is a separate legal process.

Notes construction requirements for bridleways and the need to agree this with the Rights of Way Officer. Supports new bridleways creating east-west links, with comments regarding increasing bridleway connections through the linear park, and the status of the labelled 'leisure routes'. Notes importance of underpasses for bridleways where conditions allow (rather than bridges). Queries long term maintenance arrangements for river crossing structures in the linear park, and clarification that road underpasses/bridge are to be adopted highways. Supports diversion of the footpath adjacent to school and community facilities.

Minor corrections regarding labelling of maps to be updated. Requests, by planning condition, cross-section of the eastern perimeter landscape buffer adjacent to

diverted bridleway and a rights of way scheme to confirm widths of footpaths and bridleways.

#### 5.24 MKC Urban Design

##### *Initial response*

No objection. Notes the need for the future reserved matters applications to comply with design policies, including promoting good mental and physical health and dementia friendly neighbourhoods. Supports the structure and layout as a continuation of original MK principles, based around existing natural assets, including the hedgerow, watercourses and river. Supports the scale of development along the eastern edge in relation to its impact on Moulsoe, the densities and character areas proposed, the provision of good pedestrian and cycle connectivity, and the provision of sufficient services and facilities, in accessible locations, to meet the needs of the future community.

Notes the need for a site-wide design code, and that the proposals broadly accord with the MKEDF. Considers the deviations as a result of the detailed studies to be beneficial, including the relocation of the primary and secondary schools to the community hub.

Requires conditions for the site-wide design code prior to the submission of the reserved matters applications.

##### *Revised response*

No comments on the amended plans.

#### 5.25 MKC Flood and Water Management Officer (Lead Local Flood Authority ('the LLFA'))

##### *Initial response*

Unable to recommend granting permission as the discharge rate is not agreed, and would need to be agreed with EA and Internal Drainage Board (IDB) as well as the LLFA. States the need to agree changes to ordinary watercourses with the IDB, and a 9-metre setback from IDB watercourses. Notes outstanding issue from the EA regarding flood modelling, and the need to discuss highways drainage with highways colleagues.

##### *Revised response*

Supports the outline proposal for the site. Notes the outline element seeking to drain the site via an integrated drainage system to serve highways and individual parcels. Notes that the discharge rate takes into account a 1 in 100 year event, with 40% uplift for climate change and maintains a 4 litres per second per hectare rate, and that rainfall would be managed at source and through Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) with above ground storage where possible.

Notes that storage volume within balancing ponds will initially serve highways infrastructure, and be revisited as part of later phases to assess capacity to serve the reserved matters parcels. Notes the need to engage with the IDB as the proposal includes alteration to several watercourses.

Unable to recommend approval for the highways infrastructure, as the detailed element requires further consultation with highways colleagues.

Requests conditions for detailed scheme and maintenance of highways works, schemes for future reserved matters submissions, submission of pro-forma to demonstrate water catchment compliance, details of drainage during the construction phase and an implementation verification scheme.

#### 5.26 MKC Landscape Services (Tree Officer)

Recognises that the proposal will retain a considerable proportion of the trees, but that there will be unavoidable losses. Notes that retaining existing trees is preferable to replacement, whilst noting their importance being vital to the success of new green space and varied habitats. The detailed layouts should seek to maximise the trees and hedgerows to be retained and should be factored in early to the design layouts.

Comments specifically on the significant trees, regarding the potential to move and replant them on site, noting the benefit of doing this even if the tree ultimately fails as it could take 10-20 years and would create dead wood habitats while they decay.

Supports the findings of the Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA). Requires Arboricultural Method Statements (AMS) for each phase of the development, both the building phases and the road/infrastructure phases, and standard wording of tree protection conditions, including ensuring that these take into account adjacent areas of the site being applied for.

Suggestions given regarding the type and species of trees proposed, and the need to coordinate this across development parcels, as well as provide sufficient growth areas and coordinate planting with other infrastructure, such as street lighting.

Supports the proposed tree nursery and Moulsoe New Wood (community orchard). Notes the presence of a group TPO along Tongwell Street, but clarifies that the trees present at the time of the Order were within hedgerows and no longer appear to be on site following the construction of Willen and Tongwell Street.

Request conditions for tree protection, pre-commencement Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and full details of the tree planting associated with the highway infrastructure.

## 5.27 MKC Landscape Architect

### *Initial response*

Does not fully support the submission at this time. Concerns that the winter photography for the LVIA has not been used for the baseline survey, and has been used for verified view montages only, contrary to standard methodology. Winter baseline photography is needed for full assessment of the whole site, and it would have helped select the viewpoints for the verified views. As a solution, recommends winter baseline surveys be taken this year to inform the design codes, secured by condition.

Considers that all veteran trees should be retained, as wholly exceptional reasons have not been met. Expects principles of tree lined streets to be confirmed in the design code, to balance parking with good street amenity. Supports the impression of a landscape design approach but reiterates need for this to not be reduced through reserved matters, where there will be compromise through parking standards, highways adoption constraints, densities, etc. Emphasises importance in the NPPF on street trees. Considers that the phasing plan should set the number of homes to be delivered in each phase to be tested against a layout sufficient to deliver tree-lined streets.

Considers that the parameter plans have demonstrated that sufficient buffers have been shown for play areas, with flexibility of the location. Commitment to this will need to be carried through to the design code. However, highlights the issue regarding distance to watercourses and the 9-metre easement, which needs to be considered.

Notes no guidance on building heights in MKEDF, but considers that the maximum height restrictions set through the parameters plan is too open-ended, and should be restricted further. Suggests amendments to limit the mix per area, minima or maxima, with exceptions on key streets/buildings. Notes other maxima set on employment areas near the M1 and that the proposed employment within view of Moulsoe is too high, and should be reduced from 29 metres to 20 metres, as if buildings are maximum heights they will be visible from Moulsoe. Suggests amendments or that building heights parameters plan is not agreed and considered only through the design code.

Unable to fully support green infrastructure plan as there are caveats regarding hedgerow to be retained, and this should be clarified through retention of best hedgerow. Clarification required on which hedgerows are being retained and incorporated into the masterplan. Considers removal and replacement of established hedgerow and other landscape features should be last resort, as these can assist in lessening visual impact from day one. Expects survey work of best hedgerows to inform design code, with them to be retained through reserved matters. Suggests a condition to require tree or hedgerow removals to be approved in advance, and only where necessary, including monitoring the impact on hedgerow as the reserved matter phases come forward.



### *Revised response*

Notes amendments to LVIA have been made to address Central Bedfordshire comments, but have not been made to address concern regard winter baseline surveys. Does not support the change in building heights to increase height on eastern edge from 12.5 to 18 metres. All other comments remain as above.

#### 5.28 MKC Countryside Officer (Ecology)

Notes that a number of legally protected species are likely to be affected and that Phase 2 bat surveys have yet to be carried out. These should be carried out prior to reserved matters applications, and will likely require a mitigation licence. Licences will also be required if any works affect badger setts. States tree removal should be avoided during nesting bird season, and this can be included in the CEMP, along with small mammal and reptile avoidance measures. Notes that given the timeframe of the proposed development, protected species surveys will likely need updating with the submission of reserved matters, and a phasing plan would be useful.

States that the trees with veteran features should be assumed to be veteran trees, and the proposal is therefore contrary to NPPF in avoiding the loss of irreplaceable habitats unless there are exceptional reasons. Further assessment required and detailed compensation to be provided.

States that mitigation should be provided for loss of farmland bird habitat, via a farmland bird compensation strategy. Mitigation is also required for barn owl habitat, and bird and bat boxes should be included in the LEMP. Lighting should be designed to avoid river overspill, and any crossings do not affect the river to the detriment of otters and small mammals.

Recommends a site-wide Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) be secured by condition, followed by detailed CEMP for each phase to protect ecological receptors, protected species and retained habitat. Recommends a site-wide LEMP be secured by condition, followed by detailed LEMP for each reserved matters phase.

Advises the Biodiversity Impact Assessment Metric (BIAM) should be updated as neutral grassland is unlikely to be created/maintained via management of amenity areas, and SuDS features should not be included as wildlife habitat as that is not their primary purpose. Updated BIAM should be included in a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy (BES), with a site-wide BES secured, followed by site-specific BES at reserved matters stage.

Conditions recommended as above.

5.29 MKC Countryside Officer (GCN licencing)

*Initial response*

States that there is a reasonable likelihood of GCNs being present and affected by the development, as the area is within the red impact area for GCN. Notes the intention to obtain a 'traditional' licence for GCN, and supports the option of obtaining a NatureSpace District Licence. States that either a Natural England or NatureSpace licence should be obtained, and this should be controlled by condition.

*Revised response*

Reiterates need for Natural England or NatureSpace licence for GCN.

5.30 MKC Environmental Health Officer (EHO)

*Contamination*

Considers the assessment to be comprehensive assessment of the sources, pathways and receptors at the site. Agrees with the summary and conclusions and proposed mitigation measures. Recommends securing the proposed mitigation and further intrusive investigations through planning conditions.

*Air quality*

Agrees with the conclusions regarding mitigation of dust and particulates required through the construction period, and that during occupation there would be no exceedance of air quality impacts from traffic emissions.

*Odour*

Agrees with conclusions of the report that the zone occupied between 488 and 620 metres from Cotton Valley Water Recycling will need to be restricted to industrial use, rather than residential, and that this equates to 194 metres into the site. Queries how this can be controlled. Queries that Anglian Water have provided the report regarding odour in the ES Appendix and whether the applicant's technical consultants WSP have reviewed this work.

*[Note: WSP have written the Air Quality section of the ES, the AW section is limited to a report in that appendix only].*

*Noise*

No comment received.

### *Revised response*

Accepts amendments to the ES with regard to air quality and the projected negligible impact. No change to odour or ground conditions.

#### 5.31 MKC Conservation Officer

No objection to the principle of development. Agrees with the applicant's assessment of which heritage assets are affected by the proposal: Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse (listed building, grade II); the designated assets (listed buildings, including the Church of St. Mary, grade I) and non-designated heritage assets within Moulsoe; and Campbell Park (registered park and garden, grade II). Agrees that there will be a minor adverse impact of the designated heritage assets, primarily a result of new large areas of urban built form within the rural landscape.

This impact is most concentrated on Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse (Holiday Inn), as the asset will be surrounded by the development, though the downgrading of the A509 to the frontage may have some mitigating benefits, though not enough to outweigh the harm.

The proposal would have less than substantial harm to the impact of the settings of the designated heritage assets. There is therefore an objection on heritage grounds; however, this needs to be weighed against the wider public benefits of the scheme.

The final layout will need to be considered at the reserved matters stages, in relation to Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse, with adjustments to any standard form, scale, layout and density, and careful use of green space and landscaping.

#### 5.32 MKC Archaeology Officer

Notes that several areas of archaeological potential have been identified that will require archaeological excavation including a programme of community outreach, post-excavation assessment and analysis and publication. Further geophysical surveys and trial trenching is required, and additional surveys of works already under investigation due to the uncertainty regarding the character, date, and significance of areas already surveyed.

An area of probable Iron Age to Romano-British activity identified within the west of the site has been indicated to be retained in situ and will required to be fenced off and excluded from any construction activity.

Recommends conditions regarding a Written Scheme of Investigation and fencing of appropriate areas.

### 5.33 MKC Development Plans (Sustainability)

No objection. Notes that the scheme does not intend to include a community energy network due to the development being lower density, but notes the need to comply with policy should such a scheme come forward. Acknowledges that the proposals for sustainability are indicative, and submission with future reserved matters parcels will allow response to future technologies and standards. Acknowledges that current policy standards are expected to be exceeded, though noting that on-site renewable energy generation will need to be secured. Considers this approach acceptable, provided it is secured through conditions and/or legal agreement, and contribution to the carbon offsetting fund. Supports the addressing of overheating risk and indoor air quality.

Requests a condition to secure a monitoring regime in accordance with Policy SC1 Parts K5 and K6 to calculate the as built performance and monitor 10% of homes for the first 5 years of occupation in relation to carbon emissions, indoor air quality and overheating risk. Future reserved matters submissions will need to set out how this monitoring regime is achieved.

Notes the aim to achieve BREEAM 'Very Good' for non-residential floorspace, but reiterates policy requirements in SC1 unless BREEAM 'Outstanding' is met.

### 5.34 MKC Housing Team

#### *Initial comments*

Supports the provision of 31% affordable at the appropriate tenures, and that provision should be in line with current need and policy, with the predominate need being 2 and 3 bed houses. States the requirement for affordable units to be dispersed, and to avoid clusters of more than 12 affordable units. States the requirement for policy compliant adaptable and accessible homes.

Supports securing an updated Affordable Housing Plan prior to each reserved matters submission to take into account cumulative delivery. States that the current mix shows more flats than preferred, but that currently there is a high need for affordable 1 and 2-bed properties. The flexible approach must not result in more than 34% of the site being flats. Expects 5-bed affordable units to be proportionate to provision of 5-bed market housing.

Agrees to flexibility of the provision of affordable housing at each phase, but expects precise mix to be agreed against current policy and any under supply to be preceded by an oversupply. Does not wish to see a small amount of undersupply add up over 20+ years, as plus/minus 15% delivery represents a large amount of affordable housing to each phase.

Supports the provision of the affordable extra care units to be social rent level, due to current demand, and would support the early provision of these units. Points out that

market housing must also meet local demand in the future, based on the up-to-date SHMA.

Supports the submission of a Housing Accommodation Schedule with each reserved matters submission, to correlate with plans and plot numbers.

*Revised comments [Note: comments relate to mix as shown in the proposal section of this report].*

Supportive of the revised Housing Statement. Notes that market housing mix may need to change with demand over the 20+ years of the development. Expects the developer to be flexible delivering in accordance with the latest data or SHMA at the reserved matters stage.

Agrees with the applicant that provided the number of habitable market housing rooms remains the same, then there will be no additional requirement for affordable housing. Supports the provision of an updated Affordable Housing Plan for each subsequent reserved matters application to be update the cumulative position and ensure the provision.

#### 5.35 MKC Economic Development

Considers that without the MKE allocation coming forward the Council may struggle to meet housing need and deliver the MK Strategy for 2050. Supports the provision of new jobs within the employment areas of MKE and through the creation of jobs and support of local supply chains, which will cover a wide range of professions and skill levels. Notes that there is opportunity to utilise local labour, apprenticeships within the construction phase.

#### 5.36 MKC Education Sufficiency and Access

No objection. Location, range and size of schools is appropriate for the number of dwellings planned.

#### 5.37 MKC Leisure and Community Officer

Proposal meets the requirement of Plan:MK, based on the provision of 3.2 hectares on the site, and 3.2 hectares provided by other landowners, and the minimum requirement for 6.24 hectares for a development of 5,000 dwellings.

Notes the indicative drawing of tennis courts and cricket pitches, but reiterates that the demand will be for youth football pitches, as shown in the Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS). Considers the applicant should show that the equivalent of four full size football pitches will be provided in MKE. Would be open to mixed use provision, for example football and cricket shared between clubs.

### 5.38 Central Bedfordshire Council (CBC)

#### *Initial response*

No objection in principle, considers the site should be delivered in accordance with policy, as a stand-alone scheme rather than with the intention of expanding the site at a later date.

Supports consideration in the TA of the Marston Vale development, but considers further detailed assessment of the network near Cranfield should be undertaken, particularly in relation to the sensitivity of Cranfield High Street, considering the predicted traffic increases warrant a more detailed assessment. Considers that future displacement of traffic from the A509 to M1 route will lead to more traffic routing through Cranfield. Therefore, objects on the basis of further consideration being required. Considers that contribution should be made to sustainable transport options as demand is likely to increase between Cranfield and Milton Keynes as a result of this development.

Supports safeguarding of MRT route that could be extended to Cranfield University in the future. Consultation with residents and CBC on this route regarded to be essential to consider impacts, as well as consultation on any potential future Cranfield bypass route.

Considers that the LVIA fails to address the impact from Central Bedfordshire, including distant and mid-distance views and the cross-boundary impacts, including taking into account Landscape Character Areas within Central Bedfordshire. Objects on this basis and requests an updated LVIA. Considers that lower heights should be set along the eastern edge of the site, with more landscaping, and a rural edge typology should form the entire eastern boundary. Considers that the impact of the employment areas will add to urbanising character, with cumulative impact with Magna Park, and that a more substantially landscaped edge and lower heights is required for views from the south and south-east and appropriate transition to rural edge.

Notes that development is downstream of Central Bedfordshire and includes watercourses with catchment areas within CBC's area. No objection provided development does not impede the natural flow regime of this catchment, subject to necessary planning conditions, and suggests watercourses are retained in their existing or enhanced form, and subject to consultation with LLFA, IDB and EA.

Requests that opportunities to connect new green infrastructure including linkages to areas of opportunity in CBC area are considered, such as planting of new trees to provide linkages to the Forest of Marston Vale. Also requests consideration of cross-boundary bridleway linkages, for example towards Salford Wood.

Requests opportunity to comment on construction traffic routing, and the proposal should include measures to prevent heavy good vehicles relating to construction using routes through Cranfield and Salford.

*Revised comments*

No further comment received.

5.39 Highways England

*Initial response*

Holding objection. Further review of the TA being undertaken, requiring further time to fully assess the proposals.

*Additional response*

Further time required to finalise the wording for planning conditions and S106 contributions.

*Revised response*

Notes the extent of the development and new strategic highways infrastructure and welcomes the objective to deliver strategic links to the local highway network and helping reduce pressure on existing M1 crossing points, notably J14. Notes that the in-principle designs for the new M1 bridge crossing and transport modelling have been agreed through extensive discussions. Agrees that J14 may experience unacceptable queues around 2031 and that the applicant will be required to revisit the modelling using new data once the strategic highways infrastructure has been built and is operational, with agreement to fund any additional improvements that are found to be necessary.

Requests conditions to carry out the highways infrastructure in accordance with the approved plans, that it shall be brought into use prior to the occupation of the 250<sup>th</sup> home, and that traffic surveys and revised transport modelling at J14 will be undertaken within 12 months of it being brought into use. Requests S106 clauses for proportionate additional funds for improvements to J14, should the modelling show they are required.

5.40 Environment Agency (EA)

*Initial response*

Supports the development in principle, but objection regarding the FRA as some outstanding issued regarding modelling. Welcomes the sequential approach to locate more vulnerable development outside of higher risk areas.

Further comments noting the superficial secondary aquifers and undeveloped agricultural land therefore not presenting a high polluting potential. No comments to make on contamination other than standing advice, but wishes to be notified if any is discovered – advises consultation with the EHO. Impact on groundwater quality and source protection zones should be considered when designing the proposed surface water drainage proposals.

Further comments regarding standing advice for water biodiversity features and mitigation measures outlined in ecology reports. Considers there to be sufficient capacity regarding foul water and that Anglian Water should be consulted. Considers failure to recognise the overall water stress in the area is disappointing, and that phasing of new development should be considered in relation to planned new strategic schemes to address water supply and water resource management. Considers that water resource is a key issue and Anglian Water should be consulted to ensure growth needs can be met without deterioration of waterbodies. Endorses water efficiency measures for new development, including recommending targeting 110 litres per person per day as a sustainable measure.

*Revised response*

No objection. Considers the proposal will not increase flood risk elsewhere provided a condition for finalisation of the Moulsoe Brook flood model is secured. Notes that mitigation measures outlined in the FRA should be followed in the drainage schemes for the site

Reiterates additional non-FRA comments as above.

5.41 Buckingham & Rivel Ouzel Internal Drainage Board (IDB)

*Initial response*

Notes the presence of IDB watercourses and requires that no development should take place within 9 metres of the banktop without consent, including planting, fencing or other landscaping. Storm water discharge will not be allowed without prior consent of the IDB, under their separate consent regime. Notes the proposal to extinguish a watercourse where crossed by proposed highways, which will require a legal agreement under the Land Drainage Act, which can take several months to obtain. Therefore, objects until this legal agreement has been put in place.

*Revised comments*

Reiterates requirement for legal agreement relating to IDB watercourse to be in place prior to commencement of any works. Withdraws previous objection, following discussions with the applicant. Requests conditions for details of any works that affect IDB assets, or are proposed within 9 metres of IDB watercourses, to be agreed with the IDB. Requests pre-commencement details of the drainage scheme for any phase



that affect IDB assets and drainage scheme to accompany reserved matters parcels, to require consultation with the IDB.

5.42 Anglian Water (AW)

No objection. Notes the presence of assets close to or on the site, as well as those subject to adoption agreements, that may affect the layout of the site. Requests informatives relating to the site layout to take into account adoption agreements, and notes the requirement for a 15 metre buffer to AW assets.

States that Cotton Valley Water Recycling Centre has capacity for wastewater flows. However, this will require working with the applicant to ensure infrastructure improvements are delivered in line with the development, otherwise there will be an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. Requests conditions for phasing plan and foul water drainage strategy, and informatives.

No objection to surface water drainage strategy as it does not relate to AW assets, noting other bodies will comment on that aspect of the development. Requests re-consultation if that changes, and compliance with AW SuDS design guidance if AW is to be the adoption body for SuDS features.

5.43 Historic England

No comment to make. Suggests consultation with local conservation and archaeological officers.

5.44 National Amenities Society

No comments received.

5.45 The Gardens Trust

Notes that MKE is likely to be visible in long and panoramic views for Campbell Park. Wishes to ensure that any tall buildings, taller than 'general heights' are not permitted as these would be intrusive and damaging to these views. Requests additional tree planting to break up views of the proposed development, as considers the area to be short in trees. Supports the provision of the new linear park as a continuation of the Ouzel Valley park which has considerable local historic interest, and supports adhering to the principles of the linear park to provide continuity of character within the existing open space network in the borough. Requests that the applicant work with The Parks Trust to support this.

5.46 Natural England

No objection. Supports the inclusion of a BIAM and the aim to secure 14.5% net gain. Supports the provision of green infrastructure, in particular the new linear park as semi-natural habitat, noting that the proposal falls within the Opportunity Zone 13

Ouzel Corridor of the opportunities mapping conducted by the Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Natural Environment Partnership. Notes the importance of preserving and enhancing deciduous woodland and traditional orchards, and requests further consideration and connections to green infrastructure. Supports consideration of climate change within the application, noting importance of tree planting and green infrastructure in fighting climate change.

Notes it is the LPA's responsibility to ensure sufficient Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) information, and the importance of soil handling and reuse within the site. Further standing advice (not site specific).

5.47 Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust

Notes that the development is partly within the Ouzel Valley Biodiversity Opportunity Area and supports the intention to protect most of the high value features and provide new green infrastructure. Considers that all veteran trees should be retained on site. Considers that the loss of farmland bird habitat will not be possible to mitigate on site, and that mitigation should be provided within the wider countryside to help increase suitable habitat for farmland birds. Recommends the linear park is referred to a nature reserve to support the enhancement of the whole linear park for wildlife and biodiversity. Notes the importance of allowing mammals to pass along the river bank, unimpeded by the new road bridge. Considers that a decision on this application should not be made until further GCN species surveys have been conducted.

Supports the submission of a BIAM but does not agree that fairly good neutral grassland can be achieved along community paths, allotments, due to management and soil nutrient levels. Notes SuDS features should be calculated as such, and not wildlife habitats as their primary function is as flood storage and therefore a less valuable habitat than recorded. Other minor comments regarding the calculation of the BIAM.

5.48 Sport England

Supports the intention to provide new sport pitches and looks forward to seeing detail through reserved matters stages. Considers that new developments of this size should contribute to meeting the demand generated through the provision of on-site facilities and/or providing additional capacity off-site. The level and nature of provision should be informed through the Council's emerging PPS. New development will generate demand both indoor and outdoor facilities, therefore supports the intention for community use agreements to be in place for the school sports facilities, which can also meet the demand for indoor sport.

Notes the requirements and guidance available regarding design and construction of new facilities, as well as the masterplanning of new development, and notes the phasing requirement to ensure the pitches come forward to support the new community.

#### 5.49 Public Health

Notes the need for mitigation measures for pedestrians and cyclists, with safe facilities needed for priority groups. Notes that any impact on air quality will be felt most by those with underlying respiratory conditions, noting importance of adequate noise and air pollution measures. Considers it important that facilities (parks, shops, schools) are available when residents first move in, developing norms for travel and reducing car dependence. Considers further detail on the capacity of the health hub should be sought. Welcomes focus on green space in promoting physical activity. Welcomes focus on provision of safe sustainable transport network and MRT, and promotion of active travel as vital for mental and physical health. Welcomes focus on dementia friendly environments. Notes provision of food stores and control over number of takeaways. Supports orchard and allotment spaces.

Health Impact assessments of the key issues raised in the applicant's HIA range from slightly negative (requiring mitigation: ensuring delivery of community faculties, and safe pedestrian cycle routes), neutral to moderately positive.

#### 5.50 Canal and River Trust

No comments to make on the application (falls outside notification area).

#### 5.51 Thames Valley Police

No comments to make on the application submission. Discussions had separately regarding S106 contributions.

#### 5.52 Buckinghamshire Fire and Rescue

No comments to make.

#### 5.53 The Ramblers

No comments received.

#### 5.54 Homes England

No comments received.

#### 5.55 Representations from interested parties

##### *The Parks Trust*

Supportive of the proposals in relation to the provision of green infrastructure and extension to the linear park. Notes the proposed development and green corridors with natural and semi-natural features, and new and varied habitats. Asks the applicant to consider local conditions and character in relation to landscape design,

and for this to be strategically led. Supportive of the principles for the design for the linear park, including infrastructure, play areas and landscape buffers. Notes the need to consider accessible routes, multi-functional green network, integrated open SuDS systems, including formal and informal play provision, and integration of transport network. Supportive of discussion over future stewardship of the area, the maintenance contributions secured through the S106, and recommends landscape management plans secured by condition. Asks that the applicant look into the principle of 'Strings, Beads and Settings' for the design of parkland development, and considers that further work is required for connectivity northwards along the River Ouzel to Newport Pagnell, although noting this depends on stakeholders outside the application boundary. Supportive of the access/underpass under Tongwell Street.

#### *MK Forum*

Raises concern regarding the comprehensive plan for MKE, and what will be provided proportionately between landowners, whether they are working together, including crossings of A422/A509, including in areas outside of applicant's control. Considers delivery plan to be too slow, with concern regarding delivery of facilities and services, construction phasing leading to isolated development, and ongoing impact of construction on roads. Considers the MKEDF is too general and not fit for purpose.

Considers the crossing of the M1 to be in the wrong location; that J14 needs to be redesigned now; not supportive of a one-way Tongwell Street, with concern regarding 'rat-running' through Willen; that eastern perimeter should be dualled; that grid road access and widths appears inadequate and should be controlled through design code; that plans don't show sufficient grade-separated crossings of A422/A509; and that rights of way shouldn't be closed until alternate routes are provided. Concern is raised regarding location of allotments and community orchard; surface water management; lack of open space in employment areas; and insufficient evidence of tree planting in housing areas and woodland planting.

Supports proposal for linear park but that equal attention should be given to open space in housing areas; that mitigation should be provided for farmland birds as well as bird and bat boxes. Raises concern that redway routes, segregation with footpaths and connections to schools, for example, are not clear. Concern raised with the designation of community hub, and catchment it would serve; considers community reserve sites should be included for future use; concern that there is no provision to build a community from the outset; and the provision of play areas away from grid roads. Considers provision should be made for bungalows and self-build housing.

#### *MK Cycle Forum*

Supportive of the development in principle but raises concern with a lack of crossing at J14 of M1, provision of grade separated crossings at A422/A509, and connectivity with land in other ownership. Notes the need to meet design and location standards for redways, rights of way and crossings, and the proposal to ring fence contributions for a J14 crossing.

In revised comments, supportive of the S106/Tariff providing ring-fenced funding for a cycle bridge over the M1 and a target for delivery of 2025-2030, and consideration of redway link at the River Ouzel underpass and provision of an off-road course at this location. Further consideration should be given to upgrading additional links as redways, and that the connectivity continues to be considered across the whole land ownership. Supportive of the cycle stakeholder group to engage on matters of detail.

### *Public representations*

Comments have been received from 86 members of the public. The comments raised in objection are summarised below:

#### Principle of development

- Concern that application does not comply with the Development Framework SPD; Plan:MK or Paras 159 and 164 of NPPF (specifically flooding and it is not possible to say development [will be] made safe for its lifetime due to being in a high flood risk area);
- Concern that the development will not deliver strategic infrastructure or connectivity in a coherent way across land parcels, due to there being multiple landowners;
- Concern that the equalisation mechanism within the tariff agreement (obligations) has not been agreed;
- Concern that there is insufficient infrastructure (particularly school and health infrastructure) and facilities to support a proposal of this size;
- Concern existing villages and towns will be 'swallowed up' by Milton Keynes with negative impact on rural green spaces;
- Considers MKE is too large; expansion unnecessary; could be accommodated on existing brownfield and regen areas; and set a precedent for developing in rural north-east of Borough;
- Considers that Newport Pagnell has already provided sufficient development land and that this further development is not required;
- Considers that the plans seem to provide provision for future expansion (beyond/after MKE) and that this should not be being considered prior to links to Cranfield being delivered;
- Considers that due to COVID-19 the demand for office space has declined and thus providing any as part of this application may lead to issues of oversupply and a detrimental effect on vacancy rate of existing office stock elsewhere.
- Considers provision of office space within Community Hub to be unnecessary; and employment and industry space is available elsewhere.

#### Transport/highways

- Considers that MRT does not belong in the application as it is not funded;

- Concern regarding the position/safeguarded position of the MRT and that it will never come forward due to increased reliance on cars between MKE and MK;
- Considers the application premature until progress is made on the MRT, as otherwise impacts regarding amount of car parking needed and transport modelling cannot be considered;
- Concern regarding queueing congestion existing and increasing on M1 J14; A509; A422; London Road; Kingston, Tickford and Fox Milne roundabouts (some comment these are already at capacity); Moulsoe and Cranfield;
- Concern the transport modelling is inaccurate, for the proposed and other future developments particularly at J14;
- Traffic modelling is not credible, plan does not provide a solution to congestion at J14 and surrounding area;
- Concern that the grid road/redway pattern is not being continued into MKE, and that changes to Tongwell Street destroy the grid system;
- Suggestion that the grid road proposals will become a barrier to foot/cycle movement between Willen and MKE;
- Considers the road proposals to restrict movement from Willen to Kingston Centre and Newport Pagnell;
- Does not consider additional bridge across the M1 to be necessary; or will divert traffic through Willen instead of Monks Way/grid roads;
- Concern that traffic will not be able to travel south on Tongwell Street if part of V11 is closed;
- Suggestion that proposed Tongwell Street junction should be re-thought;
- Re-direction of A509 & A422 to V11 Tongwell Street will have major impact on traffic noise which will change from being associated with rush hour and week days to continuous 24/7 noise;
- Considers HIF funding should be used for more dualling of perimeter roads;
- Considers there to be a lack of evidence that the junction on A509 will be effective;
- Concern regarding increased wear and damage to local roads;
- Concerns regarding Willen residents being able to access Grid Road during rush hour;
- Request for further detail in relation to width of Grid Road Corridor;
- Concerns regarding provision of a dedicated bus lane on each side of the V11 and its implications on traffic congestion and delays, further its resultant impact on Willen by providing a short cut;
- Considers access to Moulsoe should be a roundabout at A509, as there is already traffic during peak times and this will be increased;
- Considers no construction traffic should go through Moulsoe, and that this should be restricted by condition;
- Considers Construction Management Plan should be approved by MKC and Moulsoe Parish Council before permission is granted;
- Considers more information should be provided regarding proposed timing and phasing of new highways infrastructure;

- Queries why link to Cranfield is not shown, and that road ends on south east side of development – connection should be shown now to avoid Moulsoe and to highlight 2050 links with Cranfield Uni and Marshalls aerospace;
- Concerns of impact of construction vehicles through villages and increasing wear and tear on roads. Local roads too narrow which will increase congestion
- Queries why there is no separation of redways and footpaths;
- Queries the lack of cycle/foot bridge across M1 (to the coachway) as shown in SPD;
- Objection to lack of pedestrian/cycle connect between new development and Moulsoe, particularly in relation to school catchment areas;
- Queries plan for existing Rights of Way and their continued availability;
- Considers the dual carriageway road from Chicheley to the M1 Via the A509 should have been dualled rather than the new proposed road towards Moulsoe which will take traffic heading to the M1 plus local traffic from new housing;
- Considers that there is insufficient information to show how residents and business off the H4/V11 will be protected from additional traffic using Willen Road and new M1 bridge;
- Consider money spent on new bridge across M1 should be directed to improving J14;
- Considers that land has already been set aside for dualling of A509 under previous proposals;
- Concern regarding the safety of pedestrian access from proposed and existing residents into Newport Pagnell;
- Considers the application should be re-evaluated since cancellation of Oxford to Cambridge Expressway project as plans lean heavily on this infrastructure for housing growth;
- Considered a condition of HIF bid is provision of reconfigured section of Newport Rd to new junction of Eastern Perimeter Rd (Link 101 ON DAS). What is shown is junction onto link 110, new carriageway providing access to one of the employment areas;
- Concern about the position of the new Carleton Gate roundabout;
- Suggestion that more appropriate east-west links could be provided;
- Suggestion to make Carleton Gate a cul de sac to prevent traffic being diverted through Willen due to the highway proposals;
- Consider outer road from Eastern Link roundabout 4 to M1 should be built first to take traffic away from major building areas;
- Concern over new bridge being halfway down Tongwell Street, causing northern portion to become northbound only. Consider that bridge should join to existing Tongwell Roundabout with whole of Tongwell then dualled. Would also mean new roundabout at Carleton Gate would be required;
- Concern that closure of Carleton Gate will have a detrimental effect on emergency service response times; increased travel costs for existing residents and feeling that MKC is putting needs of new residents ahead of established residents;
- Concern regarding the impact of increased traffic on existing residents (within the site) being able to exit private roads/driveways onto main roads, etc.;

- Considers MRT safeguarded route to be out of alignment with the MKE Development Framework and the 2050 Strategy;
- Considers more detail should be shown regarding future-proofed road links to south-east;
- Queries whether grid road corridors are shown at sufficient width;
- Concerns regarding how traffic will be routed during the road works;
- Notes that HIF funded roads are dual carriageways but that developer funded roads will be single carriageways – considers SPD should have specified the need for dual carriageways;
- Considers a grade separate crossing for the A509 should be shown (between roundabout with A422 and proposed southern roundabout) – considers bridge should be provided;
- Considers a grade separated crossing should be provided at Willen Road/A422 junction to link with existing redways including Tickford Fields development/Downs Field and existing redways in Newport Pagnell;
- Considers cycle/pedestrian access required at Tickford roundabout, as only one crossing currently shown further west;
- Considers design of subways to require too much swapping for sides between redways and pedestrian links;
- Concern regarding noise and vibration of HGVs using existing roads;
- Concern that redways do not link to the site boundaries and therefore will not connect the development to other areas;
- Concern that AW and Mick George vehicles travelling northbound will be unable to turn right off of V11 and will have to come all the way round Tongwell Roundabout to take southbound carriageway and turn left – increased noise and pollution;
- Suggestion that access to AW and Mick George be closed from the V11 and that access is instead provided via H5, eliminating the need for the increased traffic, noise and pollution; and question whether these companies also shoulder some inconvenience if Willen residents have to accept some through closure of Carleton Gate;
- Concern that access to the pedestrian subway from Carleton Gate under V11 will cause removal of mature trees, shrubbery and bushes that currently provide an established privacy screen for abutting properties in Tuffnell Close;
- Considers that closure of Carleton Gate is only required because J14 of the M1 is already overloaded and National Highways are not prepared to make necessary improvements;
- Consider that speed limits should be reduced below national limit on new roads
- Considers weight limits needed in Moulsoe and Willen for construction traffic;
- Suggestion that traffic calming measures through Willen estate should be renewed/refurbished if they will be used more due to closure of Carleton Gate as currently they are deteriorating and may cause unnecessary wear and tear on vehicles.



### Ecology

- Concern regarding loss of wildlife, habitats and countryside, specifically GCN and need to acquire protected species licence;
- Concern regarding loss of trees as a result of road/junction proposals;
- Concern that the development will increase pollution into surrounding watercourses;
- Concerns regarding impact of dualled V11 on eastern side of Willen North Lake impact on migratory birds visiting the lakes;
- Queries claims on biodiversity net gain;
- Query whether Biodiversity net gain takes into account the Defra Environmental Schemes that local farms have participated in.

### Flood risk/contamination

- Concern regarding increased risk of flooding within the site;
- Concern regarding increased flood risk in Newport Pagnell;
- Concern regarding the impact on existing foul and surface water drainage arrangements at Pym's Stables;
- Noted the comments from the Drainage Board who require agreed consent to discharge stormwater into controlled watercourses, and that this agreement can take months or years to agree;
- Considers the FRA unacceptable;
- Expressed concern regarding contamination of watercourses during construction phases.

### Amenity

- Concern that new roads/improved roads will be detrimental public amenity;
- Concern regarding increase in air and noise pollution, especially from re-routed HGV vehicles and construction traffic;
- Concern regarding overlooking and loss of privacy;
- Concern that suburbanisation will have a negative impact on security;
- Concern regarding impact of road infrastructure on quality of life of residents in Willen;
- Concern regarding additional light pollution from proposed street lighting into Willen and whether there should be a lighting plan for the new road;
- Concerns regarding impact of dualling the V11 on eastern side of Willen North Lake and impact on views, noise and exhaust fumes;
- Concern regarding impact on privacy and security of existing residents;
- Concern regarding air pollution from construction, traffic and Cotton Valley Sewage Works;
- Concerns regarding the noise implications of the dualling v11 on Willen Hospice;
- Concerns regarding safety of residents in Willen due to increase in traffic from users using Willen to avoid queues on roundabouts;

- Request for further information on mitigation measures to Sewage Treatment Works;
- Suggestion that acoustic fence, landscaping and earth banks should be provided to reduce noise from cars at Carleton Gate roundabout;
- Considers noise reducing fences should be erected before work is completed to adjacent areas and to reduce noise to residents. Existing trees and shrubbery should be retained to disguise fence;
- Considers that there should be increased/further landscape buffering around residents of Pym's stables;
- Concern that pollution data is not up to date;
- Concerns regarding working hours of construction and impact on residents
- Concern regarding impact on health of Willen residents related to highways works.

#### Design, character and open space

- Concern that the proposal will change in character of the area (particularly Newport Pagnell and Moulsoe and existing rural houses) and result in loss of rural green spaces;
- Concern regarding the visual impact of the dualling on V11 Tongwell Street on existing greenery and in particular at the side of Willen Lake. Concern that the new road would dominate and change the character of the area;
- Concerns regarding the visual impact of the proposed sound barrier fencing along the V11 and its potential to attract graffiti;
- Concern with historic plan of Milton Keynes not being developed past the M1
- Concern that proposed acoustic fences will be an eyesore;
- Considers that there should be more open space and existing open spaces must be maintained and designated as permanently open to not be developed in the future;
- Considers there should be increased buffer planting to the north and east of the Phase 3 primary School, to increase visual buffer to Moulsoe;
- Considers all buffer areas must be retained in perpetuity;
- Considers Linear park should be completed and extended beyond application site to the north;
- Concern that high-density development will have negative health impacts (i.e. in a pandemic);
- Considers land should be transferred to Parish Council, MKC or The Parks Trust for long-term maintenance.

#### Other matters

- Queries lack of information on the energy efficiency of the housing design, and provision of renewable energy;
- Considers loss of the greenfield land to be contrary to government's climate change policies;
- Considers the proposal will exceed capacity of wider infrastructure (utilities, sewerage, etc);

- Specific concern about impact of new homes on water pressure, with this already poor;
- Considers the proposal to be unambitious in carbon reduction target and considers that integration with Combine Heat and Power or Community Energy Networks should be shown within the proposal;
- Considers that the requirements to implement renewable energy on all homes should be controlled by condition;
- Query regarding long-term Energy Strategy and potential for wind turbines, considers these should not be near any existing homes;
- Concern that policy SD12 (section C) has been misinterpreted and that MKE should deliver a new hotel rather than rely on existing Holiday Inn on Newport Road.

The comments raised in support, or considered to be neutral comments, are summarised below:

- Support for the grid road system with MK with housing separated from main roads;
- Support for grid road system continuing into MKE with no direct access from homes/businesses onto 60/70mph grid roads;
- Support for the future proofing of links to the south-east (road/redway);
- Support for safeguarding of MRT route;
- Supportive of closure of Carleton Gate to retain Tongwell Street as two way.

A number of other concerns have been raised which are not considered to be material planning considerations, and therefore cannot be taken into account in the determination of the application. These are summarised below:

- Concerns with public access not working in order to view documents and view/make comments;
- The need for compensation should any utilities be disrupted during construction;
- Concerns regarding working hours of construction and impact on residents
- Concerns the way information has been provided is not appropriate. Plans and information should be sent by post to local residents. Many residents may not have seen how development will affect their area;
- Consider time for consultation is too short, and considers the time for residents to express views should be extended;
- Consider that residents have not been consulted on highway changes;
- Concern regarding the loss of views of the open countryside;
- Concern that proposal is being rushed through;
- Concern that supporting information submitted to the Council is not independent;
- Traffic calming measures and police enforcement needed on London Road, Newport Pagnell along with signage improvement to prevent HGVs contravening weight limits, as an existing problem

- Concern that there is insufficient budget to complete the plans and that the Council will end up increasing council tax to pay for infrastructure;
- Suggestion that proposal is only coming forward due to political pressures;
- Suggestion that there should be plans to restrict existing traffic through Moulsoe;
- Considers the expansion of Milton Keynes to be contrary to national government's aim to deliver more housing in the north of England, rather than the south;
- Concern that the Council had not taken on board comments made in relation to HIF application raised in September 2019, regarding infrastructure layout;
- Considers that consultation is in name only – developers submitted revised plans on 10<sup>th</sup> September before a residents meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> September;

## 6.0 Relevant policies, guidance and legislation

### The Development Plan

#### 6.1 Neighbourhood Plan (NP)

The site covers five parish areas, three of which have NPs, though these plans only cover small fringes of parts of the site, mostly related to the highways infrastructure. Therefore, the following NP policies relating to transport are relevant:

- Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan (made June 2021)
  - NP6: Cycle and Pedestrian routes
- Campbell Park Neighbourhood plan (made December 2018)
  - Connectivity Policy 2: (b) pedestrian and cycle access
- Great Linford Neighbourhood Plan (South Area) (made March 2016)
  - GLPC S11: New development – accessibility, getting around and biodiversity

#### 6.2 Plan:MK (adopted March 2019)

- Policy DS1: Settlement Hierarchy
- Policy DS2: Housing Strategy
- Policy DS3: Employment Development Strategy
- Policy DS4: Retail and Leisure Development Strategy
- Policy DS5: Open Countryside
- Policy DS6: Linear Parks
- Policy SD1: Place Making Principles for Development
- Policy SD9: General Principles for Strategic Urban Extensions
- Policy SD10: Delivery of Strategic Urban Extensions
- Policy SD12: Milton Keynes East Strategic Urban Extension
- Policy ER1: Employment Sites Within the Borough of Milton Keynes
- Policy ER9: Character and Function of the Shopping Hierarchy
- Policy ER14: New Local Centres
- Policy ER16: Hotel and Visitor Accommodation

- Policy HN1: Housing Mix and Density
- Policy HN2: Affordable Housing
- Policy HN3: Supported and Specialist Housing
- Policy HN4: Amenity, Accessibility and Adaptability of Homes
- Policy HN5: Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding
- Policy HN11: Gypsies and Travellers
- Policy CT1: Sustainable Transport Network
- Policy CT2: Movement and Access
- Policy CT3: Walking and Cycling
- Policy CT4: Crossover on Redways
- Policy CT5: Public Transport
- Policy CT6: Low Emission Vehicles
- Policy CT7: Freight
- Policy CT8: Grid Road Network
- Policy CT9: Digital Communications
- Policy CT10: Parking Provision
- Policy EH1: Provision of New Schools
- Policy EH2: Provision of New School – Site Size and Location
- Policy EH5: Health Facilities
- Policy EH6: Delivery of Health Facilities in New Development
- Policy EH7: Promoting Healthy Communities
- Policy EH8: Hot Food Takeaways
- Policy INF1: Delivering Infrastructure
- Policy FR1: Managing Flood Risk
- Policy FR2: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) & Integrated Flood Risk Management
- Policy FR3: Protecting and Enhancing Watercourses
- Policy NE1: Protection of Sites
- Policy NE2: Protected Species and Priority Species and Habitats
- Policy NE3: Biodiversity and Geological Enhancement
- Policy NE4: Green Infrastructure
- Policy NE5: Conserving and Enhancing Landscape Character
- Policy NE6: Environmental Pollution
- Policy NE7: Protection of the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land
- Policy HE1: Heritage and Development
- Policy L1: Facilities Acceptable in the Parks
- Policy L4: Public Open Space Provision in New Estates
- Policy D1: Designing a High Quality Place
- Policy D2: Creating a Positive Character
- Policy D3: Design of Buildings
- Policy D4: Innovative Design and Construction
- Policy D5: Amenity and Street Scene
- Policy D8: Mains and Telecommunications Services
- Policy CC1: Public Art
- Policy CC2: Location of Community Facilities
- Policy CC4: New Community Facilities
- Policy CC5: Childcare Facilities

- Policy CC6: Burial and Memorial Grounds
- Policy SC1: Sustainable Construction
- Policy SC2: Community Energy Networks and Large Scale Renewable Energy Schemes
- Policy SC3: Low Carbon and Renewable Energy Generation

### 6.3 Minerals Local Plan (adopted July 2017)

- Policy 1: Providing for Sand and Gravel
- Policy 2: The spatial strategy for sand and gravel extraction
- Policy 3: Site-specific allocations for the extraction of sand and gravel
- Policy 18: Mineral Safeguarding and Consultation Area
- Policy 19: Safeguarding of minerals-related development and associated infrastructure

### 6.4 Waste Development Plan Document (DPD) (adopted February 2008)

- Policy WCS3: Sustainable Design, Construction and Demolition

#### Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance (SPDs/SPG)

### 6.5 The following topic-based SPDs/SPGs are relevant:

- Planning Obligations SPD (2021)
- Health Impact Assessment SPD (2021)
- Biodiversity SPD (2021)
- Affordable Housing SPD (2020)
- Parking Standards SPD (2016)
- New Residential Development Design Guide SPD (2012)
- Sustainable Construction Guide SPD (2007)
- Milton Keynes Urban Development Area Tariff SPD (2007)
- Milton Keynes Drainage Strategy - Development and Flood Risk SPG (2004)

### 6.6 The following site specific SPDs/SPGs are relevant:

- Milton Keynes East Development Framework (2020)

#### National planning policy and guidance

### 6.7 National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (NPPF):

- Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
- Section 4 - Decision-making
- Section 5 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- Section 6 - Building a strong, competitive economy
- Section 7 - Ensuring the vitality of town centres
- Section 8 - Promoting healthy and safe communities

- Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
- Section 10 - Supporting high quality communications infrastructure
- Section 11 - Making effective use of land
- Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
- Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- Section 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment
- Section 17 - Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals

6.8 National Design Guide (NDG).

6.9 In addition, national Planning Practice Guidance ('the PPG') is also a material consideration.

#### Emerging policy

6.10 The following emerging SPD is relevant:

- Sustainable Construction SPD (draft version) (2020)  
The SPD can be afforded significant weight as it is in the latter stages of being adopted, and highly likely to be adopted before a decision is issued on this application.

#### Legislation

6.11 In conjunction with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and related Acts, the following legislation is particularly relevant:

- the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (as amended) (the 'CIL Regulations');
- the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the 'EIA Regulations');
- the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; and
- the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

## **7.0 Planning considerations**

7.1 This hybrid application seeks full permission for the strategic highway infrastructure elements of the scheme and therefore all matters regarding these elements are to be considered. It also seeks outline permission, with all matters reserved for later consideration, for all remaining elements of the scheme. Thus, whilst the principle of development is to be considered, assessment of the proposed buildings, open space and associated areas, other than that related to the strategic highway infrastructure, is limited to whether the site has the scope or capacity to accommodate a sustainable development, and not whether the specific considerations of these matters are acceptable (noting it is not possible at this stage to assess such detail).

7.2 Taking account of the application type, the documents submitted (and supplemented and/or amended where relevant), the site and its environs, and the representations received; the main considerations central to the determination of this application are:

- Principle of development;
- Housing supply and delivery;
- Employment land supply and delivery;
- Community and other uses supply and delivery;
- Highway capacity, safety and parking provision;
- Impact on character of the area, design and layout;
- Residential amenity and living conditions;
- Impact on heritage assets and archaeology;
- Landscape;
- Ecological impact and biodiversity gain;
- Drainage and flood risk
- Sustainable construction; and
- Infrastructure impacts and S106 matters.

## 8.0 Appraisal

### Principle of development

#### *Site allocation and Open Countryside*

8.1 Policy DS1 of Plan:MK sets out the settlement hierarchy for Milton Keynes, focussing development on the urban area of Milton Keynes, including the New Strategic Growth Areas, described in the policy as 'Land East of the M1'. Further, Policy DS2 sets out the ambition to deliver a minimum of 26,500 dwellings between 2016 and 2031. It identifies 'Land East of the M1' in Part A.12, setting out the allocation would meet the long-term needs of Milton Keynes, and that *"this site can commence once the necessary strategic infrastructure required to make the site deliverable, including required connections to the existing urban area of Milton Keynes, is funded and is being delivered."*

8.2 In addition to the site allocation, the site is designated as Open Countryside under Policy DS5. Part A states that permission will only be granted for development *"which is essential for agriculture, forestry, countryside recreation, highway infrastructure or other development, which is wholly appropriate to a rural area and cannot be located within a settlement, or where other policies within this plan indicate development would be appropriate."* Given that SD12 expressly allocates the site for an urban extension, so to meet the strategic needs set out in Plan:MK, this latter exception is considered to have been met, with the criteria in Policy SD12 in terms of delivery fulfilled.

8.3 Policy SD12 of Plan:MK outlines that the allocation of the land to the east of the M1 and south of Newport Pagnell (hereafter referred to as MKE) is *"for a comprehensive*



*new residential and employment development to meet the long-term needs of Milton Keynes.*” It states that the development can commence subject to the necessary strategic infrastructure being funded and delivered, and that a development framework will be approved before planning permission is granted. Part C of the policy sets out that MKE will be expected to deliver around 5,000 homes, 105 hectares of employment land, schools, retail, community uses, various transport infrastructure works including safe-guarding a corridor for a MRT system and pedestrian and cycle links.

- 8.4 Policy SD12 also states that development will be brought forward in line with the relevant policies of Plan:MK and specifically Policies SD1, SD9, SD10 and INF1. Policies SD1 and SD9 relate to general place-making principles and will be discussed throughout this report. Policy SD10 requires that strategic urban extensions are only brought forward following the approval of a development framework. Policy INF1 relates to the delivery of infrastructure and funding to support development and will be discussed later in this report.
- 8.5 The Council has secured a HIF grant of £94.6m from central government to support the delivery of the strategic infrastructure proposed under the full element of this application. In addition, the MKEDF was adopted as a SPD in 2020. Therefore, the relevant policy and funding criteria in Policies SD12 and SD10 have been met to support the development of the site in principle, subject to compliance with the other policies in the development plan and any other material considerations.
- 8.6 As set out above, MKE is owned by different landowners. However, this application covers the majority of the site, and would be expected to deliver the majority of the housing, employment, and other facilities required by Policy SD12 and in accordance with the MKEDF. To that end, this application proposes around 4,000 new homes, up to 403,650 sqm of employment floorspace, and the additional facilities and infrastructure as set out in the introduction to this report. It is therefore considered that the proposal accords with the proposed quantum and mix of uses outline in Policy SD12. Given the proposed lifetime of this development, being delivered over a period of around 26 years, it is proposed to control the size of the development via conditions, to set both minimum and maximum limits on the number of houses etc. This will ensure flexibility for the future delivery of the site. The acceptability of the form and mix of uses proposed will be discussed in the remainder of the report.
- 8.7 It should also be noted that the application site extends beyond the boundary of the MKE site allocation, to the east towards Moulsoe outside the SD12 allocation and therefore solely within the Open Countryside, as well as including land to the north east and south west along existing road and river corridors to provide the necessary highway works and landscape enhancements.
- 8.8 This relates to the eastern perimeter road, landscaping to create a buffer between the allocation and the village of Moulsoe (consisting of the community orchard, one of the allotment sites and the land allocated for burial grounds), and small sections of the parcels to the south of the secondary school and north of the employment area,

directly adjacent to the eastern permitter road . It includes about half of the primary school site in that location and about a third to a half of the parcels to the north and south of this primary school.

- 8.9 The applicant has stated that this has been proposed in order to provide a coherent and logical development boundary, The boundary lines will better reflect existing field patterns and the landscape, aligning with defensible boundaries as opposed to terminating arbitrarily across the middle of fields, whereas previously the allocation cut through a number of fields, and allows for the retention of established hedgerow along the boundary for visual mitigation and ecological benefits.
- 8.10 Given that highways infrastructure is listed as an exception in Part A of Policy DS5, and the landscaping buffer would be considered "*appropriate to the rural area*" the extension of the application site beyond the allocation boundary is considered acceptable in this regard.
- 8.11 With regard to the school site and residential parcels, it is recognised that the future development of the school site could lead to the playing field/open space to be located in the area of the school site covered by the Open Countryside allocation, however it is highly unlikely that the residential parcels will solely feature open space in those areas. There is therefore conflict with policy DS5, as the application proposes built development in the Open Countryside, which does not meet the exceptions set out in the policy.
- 8.12 As above, the applicant has attempted to justify this through the site context, using the existing field pattern as justification, and the explanation that the majority of the development within the Open Countryside does meet the exceptions of the Policy. It is clear from aerial photography that the application site boundary does make sense in relation to retaining and using the established hedgerow as a well landscaped boundary to the of the community orchard and the burial ground/allotment space. As discussed later in this report, this provision of these community uses is policy compliant, which therefore would logically allow the road, and therefore the built form to extend eastwards, as described above. This could be argued to make an efficient use of land in this location, rather than allocating it for other open space, such as play areas or sports pitches, which are better located further within the development to serve the appropriate catchment areas.
- 8.13 Notwithstanding, the above, this argument is not particularly strong in support of the deviation from Policy DS5, and therefore the conflict needs to be weighed in the planning balance, in the full assessment of this proposal. Also of consideration, is that the development of the parcels can be further controlled through the Design Codes, required by condition, such as reducing the density and height of development in these locations, to reduce the impact on the open character of the countryside, as per the aims of policy DS5.

### *Other site designations*

- 8.14 NPPF paragraph 170b sets out the planning decisions should recognise the economic and other benefits of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land (i.e. that falling within Grades 1, 2 and 3a) of the ALC. Plan:MK Policy NE7 reflects this and goes on to state development involving the loss of agricultural land should seek to use areas of poorer quality land, in preference to higher quality, unless other sustainability considerations suggest otherwise.
- 8.15 The majority of the site is within existing agricultural use, which would be lost upon development. Regional ALC Maps from Natural England indicate the area is likely within a combination of Grade 2 (very good) and Grade 3 (Good to Moderate), albeit Grade 3 is not subdivided into 3a and 3b. Detailed mapping is not available for the application site itself. However, nearby land east of Willen Road (also part of the MKE allocation) is confirmed as being Grade 2, whilst Broughton contained Grade 2, 3a and 3b elements. For the purposes of considering agricultural land, it is assumed that the MKE site is likely to comprise a significant component of BMV, which would be lost.
- 8.16 Natural England have not objected to the scheme based on the loss of BMV agricultural land, but notes the need for the LPA to satisfy itself that information to assess the agricultural land classification.
- 8.17 Consideration of BMV fed into the decision to allocate the site as part of Plan:MK, which included a Sustainability Appraisal process. Whilst the loss of potential BMV land would be a disbenefit of the scheme proposed, it is considered that it is far outweighed by the economic and social benefits that would be gained as a result from the development. There are multiple sustainability benefits of MKE as a whole, including the location as an extension to Milton Keynes, with good access and proximity to Central Milton Keynes in comparison to other expansion options, and the benefits proposed to create a sustainable development, as set out throughout this report. In this context, it is considered that the loss of BMV would not be a significant material consideration to tilt the planning balance away from determining the application in line with the Development Plan. While noting the land would be lost to future use, the harm from this loss would be minimal. In addition, securing the appropriate reuse of soils on site, by condition, would be appropriate and consistent with Natural England's advice on the matter.
- 8.18 The site also sits within the Minerals Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel as set out in the Minerals Local Plan, and within the Primary Focus Area as set out in Policy 2, though no part of the site is specifically allocated for extraction in Policy 3. Policy 18 of the Minerals Plan sets out that planning permission will not normally be granted for non-mineral development that would lead to the unnecessary sterilisation of deposits in defined areas unless one of the following criteria is met: the mineral is not of economic value or feasible to extract; the development is temporary and would not sterilise future extraction; extraction is not practicable with a reasonable timescale; there is an overriding need for the development; or the development is exempt. Policy 19 seeks to safeguard adjacent minerals related development.

- 8.19 It should be noted that the site west of Willen Road has been operated as sand and gravel extraction in the past and is now restored. A site within the Bloor owned part of the MKE allocation is also currently being worked for sand and gravel extraction. Therefore, the MKE allocation has contributed to minerals production in the past, and it is considered that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on this existing extraction, thereby complying with Policy 19, which seeks to safeguard minerals development. However, the applicant has stated that it is not feasible to extract the sand and gravel in their parcel to the west of the river, prior to works needing to be started on site due to the HIF funding, and the requirement to commence highways infrastructure early in the build programme. The risk to the loss of infrastructure funding could therefore be considered to make the extraction economically unviable, though no assessment of the economic value has been provided by the applicant. However, the applicant has stated that any earthworks that occur in this area will seek to reuse the sand and gravel extracted on site, and this can be controlled through a condition, for a strategy for the reuse of materials on site.
- 8.20 It is therefore considered that the applicant has demonstrated that it would not be practicable to extract the sand and gravel within a reasonable timescale and therefore an exception to Policy 18 in the Minerals Local Plan has been met.

#### *Conclusion*

- 8.21 Overall, with the strategic infrastructure funding secured and delivered as part of this development, it is considered that the requirements of Policy SD10 and SD12 have been met for the allocation to come forward. While development within the Open Countryside and loss of BMV agricultural land does not weigh in favour of the scheme, it is considered that the benefits of the proposal outweigh these conflicts, by creating a new sustainable community which is otherwise policy compliant (as set out in the remainder of this report) and can be controlled as such through conditions and obligations as part of any permission.
- 8.22 Therefore, with regard to the policy and land use allocations for the site, it is considered that the proposal for a new community within the site boundary that incorporates the MKE allocation is acceptable, subject to the assessment of the material considerations as set out within this report.
- 8.23 It is considered appropriate to note, as part of the principle of development, that concern has been expressed by various interested parties regarding the cohesiveness of the MKE allocation between the various developers and land ownerships. The applicant for this scheme owns the majority - around 80% of the site, whilst the application for the employment land in the western corner has been submitted (ref: 21/02440/OUTEIS) and the further land parcel to the west of the site (proposing around 800 homes, a primary school and local centre with associated green infrastructure) is currently at the pre-application stage. All three applications are/will be accompanied by Environmental Statements, meaning that cumulative impacts are

being taken into account as a statutory requirement of the proposals being EIA development.

- 8.24 Additionally, though not a material consideration, each of the proposals are being considered by the same team of planning officers to ensure consistency across the sites. The applicants have been in extensive discussions with each other, to the extent that they have shared the masterplanning work to ensure consistency across their sites, as well as in relation to signing up to the Tariff Agreement to ensure equalisation and appropriate contributions are secured across the development. It is therefore considered that, through this and subsequent applications, a consistent approach to the masterplanning and infrastructure across the whole site will be achieved.

#### Housing supply and delivery

- 8.25 As above, Policy SD12 expects the allocation to deliver around 5,000 new homes across MKE, including at least 1,475 homes to come forward within the Plan:MK plan period (to 2031). This delivery requirement for Plan:MK is also noted in the text around Policy DS2.
- 8.26 Part A of Policy HN1 of Plan:MK states that proposals for 11 or more dwellings should provide a mix of tenure, type and size of dwelling which, amongst other criteria, reflects the Council's latest evidence of housing need and market demand. The policy also states that applications should take account of the 'nature' of the development proposal; for example, flats, where greater variety of house type, size or tenure may not be feasible or appropriate. In addition, the SHMA produced to support of Plan:MK (in February 2017) sets out the recommended mix of housing type and size of affordable and market housing that is needed in the borough.
- 8.27 Parts B and C of the policy state that larger residential proposals should provide a wider mix, and a range of net densities; balancing making efficient use of land while respecting surrounding context and character, with higher densities in more accessible areas. The MKEDF sets out a range of residential densities to be supported across the site, varying from 100 dwellings per hectare at the community hub, to 10-30 dwellings per hectare at the rural edge. Within the indicative character typologies the MKEDF also sets out the scope for taller buildings in the central areas to achieve these densities.
- 8.28 Policy HN2 states that proposals for 11 or more homes should provide 31% affordable housing. Part B of the policy also sets the tenure mix, with provision of 6% in shared ownership and 25% affordable and social rent. Part C of the policy requires integration and timely provision of the affordable housing, to create mixed inclusive communities.
- 8.29 Policy HN3 requires development to include an element of supported or specialist housing towards meeting the needs of older people and households with specific needs.

- 8.30 Policy HN4 requires that 60% of the new homes be built to building regulations Part M4(2) standards for accessible and adaptable dwellings, distributed across affordable and market tenures. At least 5% of the market dwellings, and 10% of affordable dwellings, are to be capable of being adapted to wheelchair accessible standard. The policy also requires all residential proposals to comply with the Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS) and good internal and external design which can be adapted to accommodating changing household needs.
- 8.31 Part A of Policy HN5 supports the aspirations of self-build and custom build homes and strongly supports proposals for self-build and custom housebuilding that involves the creation of low-cost and affordable housing. Part B requires that 1 hectare of the strategic growth areas allocated in Plan:MK be reserved for sale to self-build, to be marketed for a minimum of 12 months. This requirement for 1 hectare within MKE is reiterated in the MKEDF.
- 8.32 Policy D4 states that schemes of 50 or more dwellings will be encouraged to construct 10% of new dwellings via innovative design methods and modern methods of construction, such as modular/off-site construction techniques. This is also reiterated in the MKEDF.
- 8.33 Section 8 of the NPPF relates to making an efficient use of land and at paragraph 125 states that *“local planning authorities should refuse applications which they consider fail to make efficient use of land”* and that design codes can be used to *“ensure that land is used efficiently while also creating beautiful and sustainable places.”* The paragraph also states that decision should *“avoid homes being built at low densities.”*

#### *Quantum and density*

- 8.34 In order to fulfil the requirements of the site allocation under Policy SD12, the applicant proposes a minimum of 4,000 houses to be provided within the site, thereby being 80% of the provision on approximately 80% of the allocation. In addition, the applicant has tested, through the ES and other supporting information, a maximum number of 4,600 houses, with the associated infrastructure, services and facilities that are required to support this level of development. This equates to a 15% uplift on the proposed minimum amount, in order to stay within the remit of the “around” 5,000 new homes as set out in Policy SD12.
- 8.35 The testing of this number of houses has relied on the limits and ranges set out within the MKEDF, in terms of heights and net density, as well ensuring provision of the right number of schools and other facilities that are needed to support that quantum of development. The applicant has stated that achieving these densities will require more flats than currently recommended by the SHMA, particularly around the community hub. However, this approach is supported through the MKEDF, where a higher density is sought in those locations with a concentration of services.
- 8.36 The density of each parcel of the site will ultimately be determined through the reserved matters submission, and controlled through the Design Codes for the site,

secured by condition, with character areas and densities identified within each residential parcel, as appropriate to the location within the site and surrounding context, such as lower density at the rural edge. The balance between density, provision of other uses infrastructure, services, landscaping, has been tested by the applicant and can continue to be tested in more detail through the design codes, to ensure, ultimately that the development makes an efficient use of land while also creating a beautiful and sustainable place, as outlined in the NPPF. As discussed with the next paragraphs of the report, conditions can be secured to ensure that the delivery of this housing is assessed and monitored through each subsequent reserved matters submission to ensure appropriate densities continue to be proposed and the appropriate amount of housing is delivered in each phase.

- 8.37 The quantum of development within this application is therefore supported by Policy SD12 and DS2, the MKEDF and paragraph 125 of the NPPF. It makes an efficient use of land, which will be controlled by condition, subject to appropriate controls regarding mix of type, size and tenure.

*Tenure, type and size*

- 8.38 As described in the introduction to this report the applicant proposes to fully meet the requirement to provide 31% affordable housing within the site, with 20% affordable rent, 5% social rent and 6% shared ownership. This overall percentage requirement will be secured through the S106 agreement.
- 8.39 The number of dwellings to be provided of each type, size and tenure is based on the minimum provision of 4,000 dwellings. This overall affordable requirement of 31% will be secured through the S106 agreement and will also be required to be proportionately provided for each dwelling above 4,000 (up to 4,600) as the reserved matters applications for each subsequent parcel comes forward. The applicant has agreed to conditions to provide a comprehensive accommodation schedule for each reserved matters application that relates to housing. This would include details of the parcel applied for at the time, as well as a cumulative total and assessment of the permitted dwellings so far at the site. It will allow the LPA and Council's Housing Team to effectively monitor the provision of dwellings as the site comes forward, in terms of the proportionate and timely provision of affordable housing, as well as an appropriate mix of sizes and types.
- 8.40 During the course of this application, the proposed mix of sizes of both market and affordable homes has been revised in consultation with the Council's Housing Team. This has sought to establish an appropriate mix in size, type and tenure of the market and affordable housing provision. It included, for example, increasing the number of 5-bed affordable homes. As above, the overall tenure split has been agreed and will be secured by S106 agreement.

- 8.41 In terms of the mix in sizes for the affordable housing, there are some small deviations from that set out in the SHMA, as shown below (this table does not including the extra care provision):

	Type	SHMA affordable mix	Proposed affordable mix	Variance from SHMA
<b>Flats</b>	1 bed	10%	12%	2%
	2 bed	9%	13%	4%
<b>Houses</b>	2 bed	33%	35%	2%
	3 bed	38%	33%	-5%
	4 bed	9%	5%	-4%
	5 bed	2%	3%	1%

- 8.42 In terms of the sizes of market housing, this deviation is larger, particularly on 3-bed houses where the SHMA identifies the greatest need for market housing in Milton Keynes:

	Type	SHMA affordable mix	Proposed market mix	Variance from SHMA
<b>Flats</b>	1 bed	1%	3.6%	2.6%
	2 bed	1%	6.6%	5.6%
<b>Houses</b>	2 bed	11%	5.9%	-5.1%
	3 bed	57%	27.0%	-30%
	4 bed	25%	37.1%	12.1%
	5 bed	6%	19.9%	13.9%

- 8.43 While there is a small deviation in the affordable mix, and a larger deviation in the market housing mix, particularly 3-bed market houses; the Housing Team supports this mix as presented. It is recognised that the site will be delivered over many years, and the future need for housing in the borough may change over this time. Therefore, it is proposed to secure the mix of sizes and type of housing, within the market and affordable tenures, by a flexibly worded condition. This would be linked to future evidence produced through the SHMA or subsequent document, to continue to secure an appropriate mix of house sizes and types as the development comes forward.
- 8.44 With the accommodation schedule provided for each reserved matters parcel, as secured by condition, as described above, and the overall proportion of affordable housing secured through the S106, it is considered that an appropriate mix of size, type and tenure of housing will be secured throughout the development life of the development.

*Accessibility, adaptability and other housing types*

- 8.45 In order to comply with Policy HN3, as set out within the MKEDF, the applicant has proposed an extra care facility for older persons accommodation, to be located close to the community hub. The Council's Housing Team has made the applicant aware of the emerging Specialist Housing Strategy which identifies a need for extra care provision at social rent levels. Therefore, all of the affordable extra care units (1 and 2



bed flats) are included as social rent. Again, this approach is supported by the Council's Housing Team.

- 8.46 As above, there is a requirement within Policy HN4 to provide a proportion of homes that are accessible and adaptable, as well as meeting the NDSS. While meeting the NDSS can be considered a reserved matter of layout and scale, it is appropriate to apply a condition to ensure that an appropriate proportion of homes are built to current or future accessibility and adaptability standards (set out in local or national policy). This can be monitored through the submission of the accommodation schedule outlined above.
- 8.47 The applicants have stated that they utilise modular housing methods in their own facility, and are exploring options to deliver modular housing, to accord with Policy D4, as part of this site. As the policy only encourages innovative or modular housing, it is not considered appropriate or necessary to require this by condition. However, future reserved matters parcels would be supported were they to utilise these methods, subject to other considerations being satisfactory. The housing accommodation for each reserved matters parcel, as set out to be secured by condition above, would allow the applicants to demonstrate how they have met this aspiration.
- 8.48 The applicants have stated that, as the application is in outline, land for self-build could be incorporated on the site through the areas allocated for residential use, and this has been accepted by the Council's Development Plans Team. It is noted that the 1 hectare need only be delivered within MKE as a whole, and not specifically on the applicant's site. However, given that this application covers 80% of the allocation, it is considered appropriate to ensure that at least 0.8 hectares of land is secured for self-build, by condition, unless it can be demonstrated that it has been delivered elsewhere. This would allow for the applicant to incorporate a proportionate amount of self-build accommodation to fulfil the requirements of the policy.
- 8.49 With these conditions secured, it is considered the proposal accords with Policies HN3, HN4, D4 and the MKEDF in providing a range of homes that are adaptable, accessible and provide opportunities for supported and self-build accommodation.

#### *Delivery and phases*

- 8.50 At this stage of the application, the proposals do not include a phasing plan. This will be required to establish the order of delivery of the different parcels. However, as set out below, certain elements, such as the first primary school near the community hub, will be delivered early on in the process, once the strategic infrastructure has been delivered, and this will be controlled through the S106 agreement. A Phasing Plan will be necessary for controlling the construction phase of the site, as well as monitoring delivery of housing mix, as set out above, and the delivery of other facilities and services. A clear Phasing Masterplan will also allow the LPA to better consider each reserved matters application as it is submitted, and for the purposes of monitoring housing delivery. It will therefore be secured by pre-commencement condition.

- 8.51 In addition, the applicant has committed to bring forward the affordable housing proportionately in line with the market housing. For example, to not occupy 25% of the market homes before 25% of the affordable housing is delivered. This delivery will be secured through the S106 agreement.

#### *Conclusion*

- 8.52 Overall, it is considered that the proposal in terms of housing numbers and mix is acceptable and, when controlled by conditions, will deliver the majority of the MKE allocation to serve the needs of growth in the borough in to the future, through and beyond the period as set out in Plan:MK. Provision is made for the delivery of the range of accommodation types, with flexibility built in to ensure that the right mix of sizes and types of housing are secured into the future. The proposal therefore complies with Policies DS2, SD12, HN1, HN2, HN3, HN4, HN5, D4 and the MKEDF in his regard.

#### Employment land supply and delivery

- 8.53 Policy DS3 states that the strategy for supporting the economic needs of the Borough will be delivered through the allocation of new employment land at Milton Keynes East *“to provide a flexible supply of sites to cater for future employment needs.”* Policy ER1 includes 105 hectares of employment land at MKE within a list of sites where employment uses will be supported.
- 8.54 Policy SD12 also states that comprehensive new employment development in MKE will be delivered to meet the long-term needs of Milton Keynes, with around 105 hectares of land for a mix of employment uses. The MKEDF reiterates the need to provide a range of employment uses and the Indicative Development Framework includes land along the south-western boundary/M1 corridor of the site for employment use, as well as a small amount of employment (office) space within the mixed-use community hub.
- 8.55 The land use parameter plans for the site therefore include employment land located along the M1 corridor to provide a minimum of 403,650 sqm of floorspace across 80 hectares, plus a further parcel of 10 hectares to the west of the river that could be employment or residential in the future. This would allow for flexibility on this part of the site in the future, given the lifetime of this development. Comments have been raised by the public regarding the overprovision of office space within the plans, especially as more people are working from home since the Covid-19 pandemic. It is therefore considered that this flexibility is appropriate for this parcel, and the phasing of its delivery will be controlled through the phasing plan, and whether it is residential or employment space will ultimately be determined through the reserved matters applications. It is considered appropriate for the justification of whether the land will be in employment or residential use to be provided when this reserved matters parcel comes forward, and this can be secured by condition.

- 8.56 The provision of employment floorspace is supported by the Council's Economic Development Team, both through the provision of new jobs and support of existing local supply chains which will cover a wide range of professions and skill levels.
- 8.57 The employment land is situated adjacent to the M1 in order to provide a buffer between the M1 and the residential areas, including distance from Cotton Valley Water Recycling Centre and to provide easier access to the employment site from the M1 at J14. This approach is supported by Council's Environmental Health Officer.
- 8.58 The remaining employment land allocated outside this site is contained within the Newlands owned parcel in the western corner of the site west of Willen Road which is approximately 25 hectares. The application for this employment use has been submitted (ref. 21/02040/OUTEIS). Subject to approval of the application for the Newlands owned site, and the minimum of 80 hectares as part of this proposal, the requirement for 105 hectares of employment would be achieved.
- 8.59 Up to 2,000 sqm of additional office space is proposed at the community hub, which would be a more appropriate location for service-based offices. This would help to further the mixed-use space and take advantage of smaller units on different floors of the community hub buildings.
- 8.60 The applicant has stated that they intend to bring the employment land forward within the first and second phase of development (out of three phases and following the delivery of the highways infrastructure). As with the delivery of the other uses on site, it is considered necessary to secure a detailed phasing plan for the overall phasing of the site delivery. Alongside the early delivery of the infrastructure, followed by the first primary school and other HIF funded development which will be secured by the S106 agreement, this will ensure that the development comes forward in an appropriate order.
- 8.61 Given the above, with the limits and ranges on the amount, height and type of floorspace secured by condition, it is considered that the employment proposal for the site complies with Policies DS3, ER1 and SD12 and the MKEDF in providing an appropriate amount and location for the employment floorspace. The design and layout of the employment floorspace is considered in the design and layout section of this report.

#### Community and other uses supply and delivery

##### *Retail*

- 8.62 Policy DS4 sets out that the Council will plan for the provision of new shops, services and facilities in new residential areas. Policy ER9, part B, states that permission will be granted for new retail and services to serve new developments, with the scale defined through development frameworks to cater for day to day needs and "*not to draw trade from a wider area*". Policy ER14, part B, states that local centres will be required

in new residential developments of 500 dwellings or more, and that the majority of dwellings should be within 500 metres of a local centre.

- 8.63 Policy SD12 states that the development should provide *“one district centre and/or local centre(s), of scale commensurate to the needs of the new community and that would not adversely affect the viability and vitality of Newport Pagnell district centre, with a co-location of key facilities.”* The MKEDF refines this to propose that a Community Hub should be provided to meet the day to day needs, but that any proposal over 350sqm will be subject to a Retail Impact Assessment (RIA). The Indicative Concept Plan therefore suggests a mixed-use community hub, broadly in the centre of the north-east quadrant of the allocation, with two further local centres to the south-east and north-west (the north-west location falling outside this application site within the Bloor owned parcel).
- 8.64 The policies therefore seek to provide sufficient retail and other services that meet the needs of the new MKE community, rather than becoming a destination for shopping which draws customers away from the established town and district centres. In this case, most concern would be the continued health of Newport Pagnell High Street. The MKEDF states that the community hub should be the equivalent of Woburn Sands or Stony Stratford in serving the needs of the immediate community.
- 8.65 To that end, the applicant has provided a RIA which supports the size and location of the proposed retail offer within the Community Hub and the local centre and proposes 4,000 sqm retail space and 1,000 sqm for a commercial gym. The retail space would be use class E or sui generis, and could include up to 1,500 sqm for a small supermarket, as well as other retail services, such as cafes, restaurants, pubs or takeaways. The RIA concludes that the proposals are an appropriate scale for the new community and would not be harmful to the viability of Newport Pagnell or Central Milton Keynes.
- 8.66 Similarly, the local centre proposes up to 500 sqm floorspace in either use class E or sui generis, to provide, for example, a local shop, café and/or takeaway. This provision is considered proportionate and is supported by the MKEDF.
- 8.67 The community hub is located centrally within the eastern half of the site, close to the majority of the housing. With the provision of the local centre to the south-east (and a further local centre within the Bloor-owned parcel to the north-east) it is clear that the majority of homes will be within 500 metres of a local shop.
- 8.68 Any sui generis uses would need to be controlled via condition and the reserved matters applications to ensure, for example, that a hot food takeaway is not placed within 400 metres of a school, which would be contrary to policy EH8 of Plan:MK. Control over the provision hot food takeaway is supported by the Council’s Public Health Officer.
- 8.69 The applicant has agreed that a condition limiting occupation of the retail floorspace, linked to housing delivery, would be appropriate. This will ensure that the occupation

of the retail units does not adversely affect the vitality and viability of Newport Pagnell district centre. In addition, the phasing need to ensure that retail services come forward in a timely way, as far as commercial constraints allow, to serve the needs of the community as the lack of services is identified as a slightly negative effect comments received by the Council's Public Health officers, which requires mitigation through timely provision.

- 8.70 With the phased delivery of the retail uses, and quantum and use classes secured by condition, it is considered that the retail offer for the community hub and local centre is acceptable and the proposal complies with policies DS4, SD12, ER9, ER14, EH8 of Plan:MK and the MKEDF in this regard.

### *Education*

- 8.71 Policy EH1 supports proposals for new schools where additional provision is required, subject to safe access in all transport modes, outdoor facilities, allowing future expansions and avoiding conflict with adjoining uses. :
- 8.72 Policy EH2 sets out the minimum sizes for new schools; for primary schools 2 form entry (FE)/420 places/2.1 hectares; for secondary 5FE/750 places/7.34 hectares. Part B reiterates the need to serve the catchment area and allow for future expansion.
- 8.73 Policy SD12 sets out the requirement for primary and secondary provision, with the MKEDF identifying the need for one 10FE/11.8 hectare secondary school, two 3FE/3 hectare primary schools and two 2FE/2.1 hectare primary schools, with the primary provision being within 400 metres of most of the houses. The Indicative Concept Plan therefore suggests four primary schools located equally through the residential areas of the allocation (three within this application site, the fourth being west of the river within the Bloor parcel), and a centrally located secondary school, close to the community hub.
- 8.74 The applicant has proposed three primary schools and a secondary school which comply with these size standards. As with the community hub, the locations of the schools have been refined during the design process, and are located within the parameters plan in slightly different locations to where they are shown in the MKEDF indicative masterplan. The three primary schools are spread across the site to ensure appropriate catchment areas within the residential land, and the secondary school and one of the first primary schools are to be located next to the community hub, centrally, so to support sustainable transport choices.
- 8.75 The locations of the schools are supported by the Council's Urban Design Officer and the Council's Education Sufficiency and Access Team, and it is considered that the locations comply with the criteria in policy EH1 as they are appropriately located within residential areas with access to public transport. The final form and layout of the schools will be subject to future reserved matters applications. However, the applicant has demonstrated that the land reserved for the schools has sufficient space to provide outdoor recreation and drop-off/pick-up facilities and to provide future

expansion by meeting the minimum size standards (and as demonstrated through the applicant's indicative masterplan). These elements of Policy EH1 (or any subsequent policy) would need to be adhered to with any future reserved matters application.

- 8.76 In order to ensure the delivery of the school provision as the site is developed, the applicant has agreed that the schools will need to be delivered ahead of a certain number of houses being built. They have agreed to make the land available to the Council for delivery of the schools in advance of these triggers being met. The handover of the land at the appropriate time with appropriate access for the Council to develop will be secured through the S106 agreement, and crucially will secure the first primary school to be built on site in advance of any of the homes being occupied.
- 8.77 The remaining primary schools are proposed to be delivered at the point of 1,900 and 4,000 homes being constructed, while the secondary school would be delivered with the 900<sup>th</sup> home. The Council's Tariff Officer has indicated that the last primary school may need to be delivered earlier than this, but an appropriate timeframe can be negotiated will be secured through the S106 agreement, and included on the phasing delivery plan. As above, the applicant will be required to make the land available for the schools in advance, to ensure that the schools can be delivered by these trigger points, again through provisions in the S106 agreement.
- 8.78 Policy CC5 refers to the requirements in Appendix E of Plan:MK with regard to the provision of childcare facilities. The relevant criteria in this case being character of the surrounding area, and relationship with surrounding properties, as well as a requirement for staff parking and safe drop-off/pick-up facilities. The applicant has stated that each of the Primary Schools will have nursery provision, and that any further provision would be located in the community hub. This is considered to be an appropriate location for these types of facilities and would comply with Policy CC5 and Appendix E, subject to the detail to be resolved through future reserved matters applications.
- 8.79 Given the support for the proposed location and sizes, as well as delivery being secured for the staged growth of the development, it is considered that the proposal complies with Policies EH1, EH2, CC5 and SD12 in the proposed education and early years provision for the site.

#### *Health*

- 8.80 The requirement for a health facility is identified in Policy SD12, and within the MKEDF as requiring 0.5 hectares of land during delivery of the first phase of 450 houses. The MKEDF expands on the aspiration for a health hub to include community space and be located within, or close to, the wider Community Hub.
- 8.81 Policy EH5 states that proposals for health facilities will be provided where they meet an identified need and new residential development will only be permitted where they provide or improve facilities to serve the scale of development proposed. To assess the scale of this requirement, Policy EH6 requires development of this size to prepare

a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) to, amongst other criteria, measure the demand on capacity. Policy EH7 promotes the provision of fully staffed health care facilities to support new communities.

- 8.82 The applicant has identified that the MKE allocation will require around eight GPs and seven dentists once fully occupied, and proposes a Health Hub of up to 2,000 sqm within the Community Hub. The Health Hub is considered to be essential infrastructure and therefore benefits from funding via the HIF, to ensure it will be delivered early in the development. The Newport Pagnell South ward councillors have noted the importance of early delivery of this facility due to existing pressures for health facilities in the area. This will be secured via the S106 agreement. Early provision of these facilities is supported by the Council's Public Health Officers, though they have not commented on whether this size of facility is sufficient for a development of this size. However, the Council's Tariff Officer have confirmed that this provision for GPs is in excess of the NHS Clinical Commissioning Group requirements though noting that dental provision will only partially be through the NHS.
- 8.83 Given the above, it is considered that the Health provision within the site is acceptable and complies with Policies EH5, EH6 and EH7.

#### *Community uses*

- 8.84 Policy CC2 states that community facilities will be permitted in district and local centres, and that sport and outdoor leisure community facilities will be supported *"within or adjacent to parks and open spaces with suitable links to public transport and sufficient parking facilities."* Policy SD12 includes community facilities, alongside education, health and retail as part of the associated infrastructure required within MKE. The MKEDF seeks a mixed-use community hub surrounding a civic space, serving the needs of the community of a scale and range equivalent of Stony Stratford or Woburn Sands. Appropriate uses are considered to be *"a supermarket, small unit shops, offices, cafe/pub/restaurant, a community centre, and places of worship."*
- 8.85 The preamble to Policy CC2 states that community uses cover *"the wide range of facilities and services required by any community. It includes education, health and community care, leisure centres, multi-functional sport and community buildings, meeting places, libraries, places of worship, burial grounds, green infrastructure and open spaces and emergency services."*
- 8.86 Policy CC4 also supports new community facilities which have adequate parking and access, and which protect the amenity of surrounding uses through regulation of hours and number of attendees. It states that the provision of new community, sport, leisure and cultural facilities should be proportionate to the scale of the proposed development.

8.87 The applicant has proposed:

- up to 400 sqm of community space at the community hub;
- a pavilion/clubhouse at the sports pitches of up to 600 sqm; and
- a visitor centre, up to 600 sqm, at the linear park.

8.88 While the exact nature of the 400 sqm at the community hub is not defined, it is proposed as use class F1 or F2, which could be library, place of worship, or community hall. There are no general standards in Plan:MK for the provision of community floorspace, places of worship or libraries in new development, and Policy SD12 and the MKEDF only set the requirement for community use, not the size. In the absence of any standards or evidence to the contrary it is considered that alongside the availability of the schools for community use, and the proposed health hub to also include community space, this 400sqm provision is considered an acceptable and proportionate community use provision.

8.89 The MKEDF sets out a need to provide 2 hectares of burial space to meet future needs. A requirement for burial space is not included specifically in Policy SD12. However, burial grounds do fall within the definition of 'Community facilities' in the preamble to Policy CC2, and Policy CC6 supports burial and memorial ground uses. This is provided that they are accessible, include surface water drainage to ensure there is no threat to groundwater quality, would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding landscape, and a land management and maintenance programme.

8.90 The proposed development therefore includes 2 hectares of land for burial space or remembrance gardens, as shown on the parameter plans, in the south-east section of the site. This location is considered to fit in with the wider landscape strategy, being near the proposed allotments and community orchard, and located on the edge of the development as part of the lower density rural edge.

8.91 As a specific policy requirement that would not fall within the remit of reserved matters, the details of the surface water drainage, specific to the burial ground or remembrance gardens, and a land management and maintenance programme will be required by condition to be submitted with any future reserved matters application. With this secured the proposal is considered to comply with Policy CC6 and the MKEDF in this regard.

8.92 With the community space at the community hub, health hub, sports pavilion/clubhouse, and availability of the schools, as well as the separate provision of burial grounds, it is considered the proposal complies with the provision required by Policy SD12 and the MKEDF and complies with Policies CC2 and CC4 in this regard.

#### *Hotel*

8.93 Policy SD12 sets out that the MKE allocation will be expected to deliver a hotel as part of the proposals. Policy ER16 states that this type of accommodation will be granted in district centres as part of mixed-use development. However, the proposal for a hotel



is not expanded upon within the MKEDF, although it does expressly identify the retention of the Holiday Inn which sits centrally to the site.

- 8.94 The applicant has not proposed a hotel as part of the community hub, although the description of development would not expressly prevent one coming forward as part of any reserved matters proposal, subject to the limits placed on the commercial floorspace by the proposed conditions herein. In any event, the retention of the Holiday Inn would ensure that hotel accommodation is provided within MKE.
- 8.95 The Council's Development Plans Team initially queried the lack of hotel within the submission, and the applicant has clarified that they consider that the Holiday Inn serves to meet the requirement of Policy SD12, as it is a well-established large hotel, within the site allocation area, therefore meeting the aims of this policy. This explanation was accepted by the Development Plans Team, and as the hotel is to be retained on site, and the aims of policy ER16 are to support visitor attractions in the city, it is considered that the provision of an additional hotel within MKE is not strongly justified by policy. On this basis, the lack of hotel proposal is accepted.

*Linear park, playing fields, local play and other open space*

- 8.96 Policy NE4 states that green infrastructure will be "*protected, extended and enhanced for its biodiversity, recreational, accessibility, health and landscape value and for the contribution it makes towards combating climate change.*" Part E of the policy supports the extension of the linear park network in the urban extensions, which, among other criteria, would be strategically planned, meet the needs of existing and future residents, achieve net gains in biodiversity, connect with other green infrastructure and is managed in the long-term.
- 8.97 Policy DS6 sets out that proposals within the linear parks should meet a number of objectives, including protecting and improving the landscape and nature conservation value, protecting and interpreting areas of archaeological interest, providing access for recreation, minimising adverse impact on residents and agriculture and flood control. In addition, Policy L1 sets out the acceptable leisure and recreation uses in the parks, provided they wouldn't be detrimental to the environment, flood risk or visual impact, and can be accessed easily.
- 8.98 Policy SD12 and the MKEDF requires the creation of a linear park alongside the River Ouzel to include recreational routes for pedestrians and cyclists, safe crossings, and enhanced biodiversity. Also highlighted in the MKEDF is the need for Neighbourhood Play Areas and Local Play Areas serving appropriate catchment areas.
- 8.99 Policy L4 and Appendix C of Plan:MK set out the requirements for providing open space and recreational facilities in new housing development, in order to support the delivery of a linked network of multi-functional, resilient and sustainable green infrastructure. Part C and D set out the requirement for management and maintenance plans for all types of new open space. Part F of Policy L4 requires and that all residents have access to natural green space in accordance with Policy NE4.

- 8.100 Policy EH7, Part A1, supports the provision of playing pitches, open space and parks, sports recreation facilities and outdoor gyms to increase access to sport and recreations and reduce levels of physical inactivity. Parts A3 and A4, as well as Policy CT3, also support new walking and cycling routes.
- 8.101 The application proposes a 63 hectare linear park alongside the River Ouzel that will link with other green features throughout the development, including a link along Moulsoe stream to the east of the site, connections along other routes throughout the site, pedestrian and cycle links, routes over the river, and a visitors centre. Aside from the road bridge crossing of the river through the centre of the park, the final detail of these routes and facilities will form part of the reserved matters applications.
- 8.102 Overall, the landscape strategy plan shows a network of linked open spaces that will allow and encourage walking and cycling throughout the development, showing green corridors and pocket parks between the residential parcels, which will give easy access to open space to all new residents. The creation of new linear park is supported by consultees, including The Gardens Trust who support the continuation of the Ouzel Valley Park given the local historic interest and character of the linear park system in Milton Keynes.
- 8.103 As required by policy, it is considered appropriate for all future applications, which include the reserved matter of landscape, to include a landscape management and maintenance plan to set out how the area will be managed. The biodiversity and archaeological aspects of the linear park will be discussed later in this report. It is considered that the proposals in the linear park and green infrastructure strategy comply with Policies DS6, SD12, NE4, L1, L4, EH7 and the MKEDF in this regard.
- 8.104 The application proposes a 3.2 hectare sports pitch facility, to the north of the community hub to provide community access to sports. The Council's Leisure and Community Officer supports the size and location of the provision, noting that the same size sports pitches are to be provided as part of other applications for MKE and that combined they exceed the requirement for a development of 5,000 houses. The facility will include a pavilion/clubhouse. Newport Pagnell Town Council have expressed the opinion that a sports facility should not be included within the site, and that new sports facilities in this area of the borough should be concentrated within Newport Pagnell's own existing facilities. However, for a community of this size, new sports facilities are necessary to support both recreation and healthy lifestyles. Two areas of playing fields are included within the MKEDF, though the proposed location within this application site was to the south-east of the site near Newport Road, (the other provision proposed on land owned by Bloor Homes, off-site to the north of the A422.) While there is some deviation from this plan, it is considered that the relocation is not unacceptable, given the proximity to other community uses, and the other landscaped space proposed in the concept plan location at Newport Road (community orchard, allotments and burial ground).

- 8.105 Additionally, the Leisure and Community Officer has expressed concern with the indicative masterplan showing cricket and tennis courts, while the Council's PPS identifies a need for youth football pitches, though noting mixed provision may be suitable. Sport England's comments reiterate the need for sports pitch provision and the need for demand to be identified through the PPS. As noted by Sport England, the detail of the type of provision will come forward through the reserved matters phases, as the masterplan is only indicative, and the exact type of sport facility can be determined to ensure that the right type of provision, to serve the needs of the new community is provided.
- 8.106 Sport England also notes that there will be demand for indoor facilities as well as outdoor facilities, which can be supported through Community Use Agreements for use of the sports halls. This would not be a reserved matter so will be secured by condition as part of matter for this permission.
- 8.107 The application also proposes eight Local Play areas and four Neighbourhood Play areas, spaced throughout the site, to meet the appropriate catchment for the residential areas. These are shown on the Parameters Plans, with the final design to come forward through the reserved matters applications, alongside a landscape management and maintenance plan. The Council's Landscape Architect has confirmed that appropriate provision, and sufficient buffers have been provided, though highlights the IDB 9-metre easement to watercourses that will need to be complied with. This easement is controlled through the IDBs consenting regime, and the exact position of the play areas, and appropriate buffers will be secured through reserved matters applications.
- 8.108 Any further open space described in Policy L4 and Appendix C, such as additional pocket parks and amenity open space within the residential parcels, will come forward through the reserved matters applications. The minimum sizes and catchment areas for these spaces are set out in Appendix C and will therefore need to be provided through landscape reserved matters, alongside landscape management and maintenance plans as set out above.
- 8.109 Policy EH7, Part A2, aspires to provide access to allotments, and Policy L4 Part A and Appendix C sets out that new allotments should be provided in areas of high demand and based on current waiting lists, and would normally be located with other open space with catchment of 700 to- 1000 metres. The MKEDF includes two spaces within the indicative masterplan, on either side of the river, that each should be 0.6 to 0.8 hectares in size and at least one should be near the higher density housing (i.e. near the community hub).
- 8.110 In this proposal, the applicant has provided indicative space for three allotment sites totalling 1.7 hectares, to ensure all homes are within the catchment area, as well as a community orchard on the eastern boundary near Moulsoe. This provision is supported by Council's Public Health Officers, for both the mental and physical health benefits of outside space and provision of local fresh food. Given the over provision,

and appropriately separated locations, the proposal is considered to acceptable in this regard.

### *Conclusion*

- 8.111 Given the above, it is considered that the applicant has proposed an appropriate range of community facilities that can be adequately secured at appropriate triggers via conditions and S106 agreement, with the final layout, scale, appearance and landscaping to come forward through the reserved matters applications. The proposal therefore complies with the aforementioned policies and Policy SD12 and the MKEDF in regard to community facilities.

### Highway capacity, safety and parking provision

- 8.112 Policies CT1 and CT2 seek to ensure that development proposals are sustainable in regard to traffic generation and general accessibility to all users of the highway. New development should minimise the need to travel and support transition to a low carbon future.
- 8.113 Policy CT3 seeks to ensure that developments are easily accessible to employment, essential services and community facilities by walking and cycling, creating safe and well-lit routes and give priority to pedestrians and cyclists. Policy CT4 also seeks to protect and enhance the existing redways in the borough, and Policy EH7 aspires to create and enhance the cycling and walking networks, to support connectivity.
- 8.114 Policy CT5 requires that new developments make specific consideration to the needs of public transport services. Where appropriate, no development should be more than 400 metres from a bus stop, which should have good pedestrian access, be open to surveillance and sheltered.
- 8.115 Policy CT7 aims to ensure that freight movements are fast and efficient, and that proposals that include junction improvements will assess the traffic impacts from freight.
- 8.116 Policy CT8 emphasises the unique asset of Milton Keynes' grid road network and complementary redway system, including the grade separated crossings. Part C of the policy requires extension of the grid into new development areas to ensure it continues to work effectively, including safeguarding land for future highway links and landscaped corridors, including for cross-boundary development. Part D sets out the criteria for grid roads to include safeguarded land, accommodation of main services, landscaped corridors, public transport features and safeguarding for future technology, as well as specify criteria for setbacks and widths.
- 8.117 Policy CT10 seeks to ensure that development proposals are in accordance with the Council's adopted car parking standards unless mitigating circumstances indicate otherwise. The policy also states that on-site parking should not be reduced below the Council's full expectations if this would increase additional pressures in off-site parking

that could not be resolved by on-street parking controls. Policy CT6 states that the Council will maximise the use of sustainable transport in developments and support low carbon public and personal transport. In addition, the policy states that electric vehicle (EV) parking spaces are to be provided at a rate of 1 per every new dwelling. Policy HN1 Part E states that where developments propose low levels of parking to achieve densities that support achievement of wider strategic objectives, there must be evidence that there are frequent and accessible public transport services.

- 8.118 Policy SD12 sets out the expectations for delivery within MKE and includes (Part C 4-6) the requirement for transport infrastructure for new grid road connection to H4/V11, Newport Pagnell and CMK, including a new and/or enhance vehicular crossing of the M1; land safeguarded for a mass rapid transit system (MRT), connecting to CMK; and new footpaths, cycleways, bridleways including the provision of *“appropriate”* crossings of the A422 and M1.
- 8.119 The MKEDF goes further, setting out through the indicative concept plan the provision of two new grid roads, the western road branching off Tongwell Street and crossing the M1 (safeguarded for MRT) to link with the A509, and the eastern grid road replacing London Road (A509) through provision of an eastern perimeter road. The MKEDF specifies that connections across new grid roads should be grade separated underpasses or bridges, and that *“at grade crossings are not appropriate on the grid road H3 Monks Way (A422) or on Willen Road (not a grid road) within a distance that would have an adverse impact on traffic flow or on the H3 or Tongwell Roundabout.”*
- 8.120 The MKEDF also specifies the need for pedestrian priority through the community hub, with land safeguarded for the MRT, as well as prioritising the creation of walkable neighbourhoods, extension of the borough’s redway network into the site, including to strategic points such as the community hub, as well as three crossings to the A422/A509 northern boundary of the site (two sit within this application site), and a pedestrian/cycle bridge south of J14 across the M1.

#### *Transport modelling/traffic generation*

- 8.121 The applicant has undertaken extensive modelling works through the TA to consider the impact of both the development itself (between 4,000 and 4,600 houses), the whole MKE allocation, and the wider area - , including committed and planned development, such as Tickford Fields (ref: 20/00133/OUTEIS) south east of Newport Pagnell, and movements of all types of traffic including industrial , commercial and residential. Extensive pre-application discussions have been conducted with the Council’s Highways Officers and Highways England in order to agree the approach to transport modelling of the surrounding roads, which assesses the size of the development, traffic generated and the impact based on the proposed new roads and junction improvement, including the impact on J14 at the M1.
- 8.122 The conclusion of this modelling work is that the strategic infrastructure within the site is sufficient to enable the MKE allocation to come forward. The modelling,

including the revisions to take into account the changes during the application at Carlton Gate/Tongwell Street, is supported by the Council's Highways Officers.

- 8.123 Highways Officers ultimately note that the modelling work indicates that there will, inevitably, be an increase in traffic. However, redistribution over new infrastructure will lead to some junctions experiencing a reduction in use, and that most junctions would be over capacity without MKE, requiring interventions post 2031 in the absence of the development. The conclusion is therefore that significant impacts have been mitigated for through the combination of the proposed junction improvements and new infrastructure.
- 8.124 Highways England have suggested a number of conditions and clauses within the S106 to propose a "monitor and manage" regime to control the delivery of improvements, to the highways infrastructure including J14 of the M1. These conditions and S106 requirements will be secured.

*Highways Infrastructure – new grid roads, crossing and junctions*

- 8.125 As described above, the proposal includes the provision of two new grid roads, one a western road creating a new crossing of the M1, crossing the linear park and amalgamation into the A509. The eastern grid road creates a new link between two points of the A509 at the southern point near the M1 and at the north-eastern part of the allocation, round to the east creating a new eastern perimeter road to the site.
- 8.126 The grid roads broadly follow the layout set out in the MKEDF and, alongside the primary link roads, will ensure that the application site is well served by an appropriate road network which meets the needs of the development for the future.
- 8.127 Some concern has been expressed, in particular from Newport Pagnell Town Council, that part of the eastern perimeter road is currently only proposed as single carriageway. Para 4.3.3 of MKEDF states that "*grid roads will be future-proofed to accommodate dual carriageways. Transport modelling will determine to what extent they should be dualled from the outset.*" Modelling data shows that it would be unnecessary, and excessive to make this route a dual carriageway at this time, and a balance is needed between provision of necessary infrastructure, and excessive hard surfacing within the countryside at this rural edge, with regard to landscape, ecology and character of the area. Notwithstanding the above position, funding is secured to dual this road in the future when monitoring shows that it is necessary. The triggers for this and funding are controlled through the S106 agreement, and are index linked so appropriate funds are secured whenever they are necessary.
- 8.128 Highways England have requested conditions to ensure the provision of the infrastructure is delivered in accordance with the strategic plan prior to the occupation of the 250<sup>th</sup> new home. Highways Officers have requested final detailed design drawings of the highways infrastructure to be secured by condition. With these conditions secured, alongside the condition for a phasing plan, it is considered the

new highways infrastructure is acceptable and will be delivered in a timely way to serve the needs of the development and the wider borough.

*Highways Infrastructure - Tongwell Street/Carlton Gate*

- 8.129 As described above, the original proposal for this scheme involved the closure of Tongwell Street southbound to create a roundabout at the junction with the new crossing of the M1. Many concerns were raised with this approach, including objections received from local residents and the MK Forum. However, in principle, Highways colleagues accepted that it was a suitable, although not an ideal solution at this junction. Objections included the primary concern that roads within Willen would become a 'rat-run' through the estate, and the concern with increased noise from a roundabout junction close to the homes in Willen.
- 8.130 The applicant has responded by putting forward an alternative proposal, involving retaining Tongwell Street as two-way, and closing the entrance to Willen at Carlton Gate. The proposal (as the roundabout solution did before) includes acoustic fencing to minimise noise impacts from a new junction.
- 8.131 While this proposal is not supported by all residents, Campbell Park Parish Council and Cllr Crooks have noted that this solution is supported by the majority, following a Parish Council survey and public meeting which the applicant attended to explain the proposals. Objectors to the scheme raised the observation that residents of the south of Willen will be required to drive all the way to the north and exit at Millington Gate, rather than being able to enter at the south-east location of Carlton Gate. While it is agreed that this would be inconvenient, it is considered suitable in order to maintain Tongwell Street as two-way road, and to maintain the integrity of the grid road network. Highways Officers have no objection to this proposal. Cllr Crooks has suggested that money safeguarded to mitigate the impacts of MKE in Willen would allow the Council to make interventions if necessary (as justified, and in consultation with local residents), due to potential issues with exiting Willen from Millington Gate during peak times. It is noted that the closure may require a stopping up order, depending on the technical details of the highway works, but this is consented outside of the planning process.
- 8.132 It is therefore considered that the revised proposals represent a suitable solution to achieve the necessary additional crossing of the M1 in this location, while mitigating the impacts on residents of Willen and maintaining the grid road system.

*Highways Infrastructure – upgraded highways and junctions*

- 8.133 In addition to the changes at Tongwell Street, the application site includes a number of roads and roundabouts within the existing built up area to the west of the M1, and the required junction improvements to support the delivery of MKE. These changes have been submitted as part of the detailed planning application, and include the following:

- Minor improvements at Blakelands Roundabout;
- Minor physical changes to Willen Road;
- Improvements to exits and/or potential signalisations at Pagoda Roundabout, Woolstone Roundabout, Marsh End Roundabout, Fox Milne Roundabout and Pineham Roundabout.

8.134 The delivery of these highway infrastructure works will come forward as part of the first phase and are secured through the conditions, as suggested above, and the S106 agreement. Highways Officers have assessed these proposals and find them acceptable, subject to final detailed design work. The applicant has already begun a submission for Section 278 technical approval of the detailed highways drawings, in order to be able to deliver them in a timely fashion, and because of the delivery objectives associated with the HIF funding.

8.135 Further offsite works to mitigate for highways impacts will be delivered through ring-fenced money in the tariff/S106 agreement, allowing for flexibility in the improvements necessary. However, Highways Officers have noted this does raise uncertainty in the delivery and format these improvements will take. The Council's Tariff Officer has been in extensive discussions regarding these contributions, with the applicant and highways to ensure the appropriate contributions and monitoring regime is secured in order that the appropriate mitigation is provided at the correct time. To this regard, Highways Officers find the provision for off-site works acceptable.

8.136 Therefore, in relation to the highways infrastructure it is considered that the applicant has put forward an acceptable scheme, that has demonstrated it can support the delivery of the development outlined. The applicant has taken on board the comments and concerns raised by the public to produce a scheme that resolves key issues, such as the additional crossing of the M1 while retaining the classic grid road network. The improvements to existing junction and the safeguarding of the road network for the future.

#### *Mass Rapid Transit safeguarding*

8.137 As above, Policy SD12 and the MKEDF set out the framework for safeguarding a route through MKE for a future MRT project, including access through the community hub to serve the highest density part of the development, and safeguarded within the crossing of the M1. The MRT would also potentially link to the park & ride (off site to the north-east of the site) with potential future links to Cranfield.

8.138 While it is not currently known what form the MRT will take, the applicants have shown the safeguarded route within the movement and access parameter plan, as well as within detailed highways drawings that would be approved as part of the detailed design for the highways infrastructure. The land and corridor widths are considered appropriate, and would allow, for example, a lane in each direction of the new bridge across the M1 to be reallocated to MRT should it be deemed appropriate in the future. The safeguarding approach and road widths are supported by the Council's Highways and Transport Policy Team



8.139 The proposal therefore complies with Policy SD12 and the MKEDF in this regard, in both the specifics of safeguarding land for the MRT, as well supporting the aims towards sustainable travel in the future.

#### *Public transport*

8.140 In order to comply with Policy CT5 and the MKEDF the applicant has stated that bus stops will be placed so that all residents are within 400 metres of a bus stop, and committed to the creation of a multi-modal transport hub at the community hub. This will facilitate extending existing bus routes into Milton Keynes, Newport Pagnell and other destination as well as supporting other services such as demand responsive travel services, and ultimately the MRT.

8.141 The Council's Transport Policy Team note the need for a core route for bus services to be safeguarded for when commercial routes become viable, expecting bus new routes, rather than co-opting of existing routes. The final details of the highways infrastructure can secure the provision of bus stop infrastructure, as well as in the areas of the site subject to reserved matters applications. The interim solution for public transport will be through the provision of the DRT service, with the scheme extended into MKE at the appropriate time. This approach is supported by the Council's Transport Policy Team.

#### *Walking and cycling*

8.142 The applicant states that their proposal has been designed on the concept of 15-minute neighbourhoods, meaning that the majority of homes are within a 15-minute walk of essential services. The applicant's layout plan shown that the majority of homes are within 15 minutes of the local services and facilities at the community hub, and that all homes are within 15 minutes of a primary school, via redways or footpaths. The development therefore will be able to promote walking and cycling as the primary method of transportation, and the further detailed design work of future reserved matters will be able to further promote these aims.

8.143 Two proposed crossing points of the A422/A509 northern allocation boundary fall within the site, and the applicant has confirmed a bridge at the crossing to the east, which falls within the full/detailed design part of the application. The second crossing, close to the centre of the northern boundary, may require additional land purchase on the north side of the A422/A509, which is currently in private ownership, in order to support the delivery of a bridge or underpass, and this element of the infrastructure currently falls within the outline element of the scheme, to be delivered via future reserved matters. Delivery of this crossing is important to the provision of safe and secure pedestrian and cycle links to the north in Newport Pagnell, given its location close to London Road, and its logical location as one of the main routes between Newport Pagnell and MKE. With the proposal secured on the parameter plan as either a bridge or underpass, detail of this link will therefore come forward through a reserved matters application, and the applicant's "best endeavours" to provide this

underpass can be secured via the S106 agreement. While not a full solution at this stage, it would require the applicant to continue to negotiate and do all they can to secure any land to provide this link.

- 8.144 While Policy SD12 expects the provision of a crossing of M1 “*as appropriate*” and the indicative concept plan in the MKEDF shows a new bridge to the south of J14, no new separate pedestrian/cycle crossing of the M1 is proposed as part of this application. It is proposed, however, to secure ring-fenced contributions within the S106 agreement for the provision of this route, though it is dependent on land ownership on the Broughton side of the M1 and therefore still subject to feasibility. The applicants have undertaken extensive discussions with MK Cycle Forum on this issue, who have outlined the necessity of this link to support the cycle connections to the south-east of the site. The Cycle Forum are ultimately supportive of the commitment to targeting the provision of the bridge through the S106 agreement and the target for delivery being brought forward to 2025-2030, and utilising the ‘all reasonable endeavours’ clause through the S106 is supported by a number of consultees.
- 8.145 Additionally, in order to fulfil the design criteria of the new grid roads, both within the site include new grade separated road crossings, including bridges and underpasses along the length of the roads at appropriate intervals, linking up with existing right of way, or located to serve different desire lines between residential and employment parcels, with flexibility as the final layouts for those parcels come forward. Initial comments have been received from the Council’s Highways and Cycling officers that further detail of the connections is required to ensure connections continue on through and out of the development, such as cycleways, becoming footpaths, then leisure routes, and not remaining a cycle path along the whole length. Broadly these comments have been addressed through the infrastructure plans, and can be addressed in the detailed element of the scheme through the suggested highways conditions for final details (and ultimately through S278 and S38 agreement for technical approval and adoption from the highway authority). For any areas covered by the outline scheme, the detail can come forward through reserved matters application (for landscape and layout) and further control enacted through the design codes.
- 8.146 The provision of extensive routes is supported by the Council’s Public Health officers, offering the mitigation required to impact the “*slightly negative*” effects identified in the HIA, as well as broadly by the Forum and Council officers noted above, noting the need to ensure the routes are safe and accessible, and the benefits of active travel on mental and physical health.
- 8.147 The Council’s Travel Plan officer is broadly supportive of the outline travel plans provided with the application and notes the need for travel plans to be secured via the S106 agreement. This requirement, and a monitoring fee, will be secured through the S106.

### *Rights of Way*

- 8.148 As above, there are a number of existing public rights of way through the site, and the MKEDF supports the provision of new Rights of Way through the new linear park, and the east-west green route. These are shown on the access and parameter plan, including the links under the new grid crossing of the river, with further detail to come forward at the reserved matters stages.
- 8.149 The Council's Rights of Way officer is generally supportive of the proposals, supporting the realignment along green corridors, towards community hub and schools, avoiding estate roads, and ensuring separation from redways. The Rights of Way officer has requested a condition for the detailed location and design of the Rights of Way on the site, including to the specific construction for bridleways, the importance of utilising underpasses rather bridges on bridleways and construction widths required. This will be secured by condition.

### *Parking*

- 8.150 The site is currently contained with Zone 4 of the Parking Standards SPD, which was adopted in 2016. Zone 4 relates to the rural area of the borough, and the parking requirement for homes and businesses reflects this, requiring higher levels of parking spaces to accommodate the more likely private car ownership given the more isolated nature of the area and less frequent public transport services.
- 8.151 As the entirety of the built form is covered by the outline element of the proposal, the amount of parking provided on site will be covered by each reserved matters parcel for the separate elements of the site, and assessed when considering the layout of those future phases of development. However, it is currently unknown what the future policy environment might be regarding parking provision and what provision of low carbon solutions for private transportation there might be in the future. Additionally, as noted above, the site is currently within Zone 4 of the Parking Standards SPD, but the way the site will ultimately be built will make the development more akin to the suburban areas of Milton Keynes, with provision of key services within walking distance. The provision of the MRT, as discussed above, is also likely to affect the appropriate zoning for the community hub, and other areas along the MRT route/stops in the future. As a result, a Zone 4 provision against the current 2016 standards is unlikely to be appropriate in the long-term.
- 8.152 In calculating density and assessing the likely application of the Parking Standards in the development parcels delivered early on, the applicant, in consultation with Highways Officers, has assumed that the Community Hub and higher density housing areas will be assessed as Zone 2, the majority of residential areas will be Zone 3 and the rural edge character areas may present as Zone 4. While ultimately the parking standards will need to be applied at the appropriate time against the forthcoming reserved matters parcels, in general this approach to applying the standards is likely to fulfil policy requirements, but ultimately will be decided through any future revision to the Parking Standards.

8.153 Therefore, to ensure that the appropriate amount of parking is secured for the different elements of the proposal, and to ensure appropriate provision of infrastructure to support low-carbon private vehicles for the future, a condition will be secured. This will require the parking proposed on future parcels to be policy compliant in terms of numbers, sizes and provision of electric vehicle charging points, or any subsequent technology as required by the policy at the time, in relation to future policy on parking and/or Parking Standards.

8.154 With this condition applied it is considered that parking provision for future occupants and visitors of houses and flats, as well as employees and visitors to business and services, will be secured. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies CT6 and CT10 of Plan:MK.

#### *Conclusion*

8.155 Subject to the detailed design work, the provision of the junction improvements, pedestrian/cycle connections, future off-site works, safeguarding of the MRT route and future policy compliant parking, secured via conditions and the S106 agreement, it is considered that the proposals are acceptable and in accordance with Policies CT1, CT2 CT3, CT4, CT5, CT7, CT6, CT8, CT10 and SD12 and the MKEDF in providing safe sustainable routes, and promoting walking and cycling through, to and from the development.

#### Impact on character of the area, design and layout

8.156 Policy SD1 sets out the place-making principles for development and the principles for development in the urban extensions. Proposals should promote healthy and safe communities which integrate well into the surroundings, encourage connectivity and respect surrounding scale, density and materials to enhance the character of the area in which it is located. The layout of new development should respect the principles that have been established in Milton Keynes, especially the grid road system, redways and linear parks, and the layout of housing in perimeter blocks to overlook public spaces. Different character areas should be created where appropriate through the use of varied densities, landscaping, layouts, architecture and public realm.

8.157 Policy NE5 requires, where appropriate, planning applications to be supported by a Landscape Visual Impact Assessments (LVIA) and to demonstrate how the proposal has been informed by its findings. The policy requires development in the open countryside, which has otherwise been found to be acceptable in principle, to respect the character of the surrounding landscape, ensuring it is conserved and enhanced where possible, taking account of important views, historic setting and distinctive landscape features.

8.158 The design policies D1, D2, D3 and D5 set out principles to achieve high quality development which creates a positive character is well connected and legible, and respects its surroundings. These policies set out specific criteria related to design,

layout and landscaping, to ensure well-designed, accessible, diverse, healthy and safe communities. In addition, Policy EH7 promotes the provision of good quality and well-designed housing.

- 8.159 Policy SD12 identifies the main features that are required to be provided and requires a comprehensive development framework to be prepared for the site. The MKEDF has been adopted by the Council and includes an Indicative Concept Plan. This builds on the Plan:MK policy, and spatially defines these features, such as the layout of the road network and the linear park.

#### *Landscape impact*

- 8.160 The application has been accompanied by a LVIA to assess the character of the area and the impact of the proposal on the surrounding landscape.
- 8.161 The Council's Landscape Architect has expressed concern that no baseline winter views were submitted as part of the LVIA. However, the applicant has confirmed that the Verified Views Montages use winter photos taken in December 2020, which show where the visual impacts will occur. Notwithstanding this, the Landscape Architect has suggested, and the applicant has agreed, that further winter views would be helpful in developing the design codes and detailed design submissions for the site. It has been agreed to address this within the conditions requiring the submission for the design codes.
- 8.162 Additional requests regarding the LVIA were made from CBC who noted that views were likely to be seen from cross boundary locations, with concern regarding the impact on rural character. The applicant has provided these views in an addendum to the LVIA, but at the time of writing no further comments have been received from CBC.
- 8.163 The extensive masterplanning work for the site, undertaken by the applicant, has refined the concept plans set out in the MKEDF. This has taken into account site features and the outcome of the LVIA, and accommodate the amount and type of development required within the site. The location of the different services and infrastructure, such as the schools and play areas, has been determined by the required catchment areas. In addition, the proposed heights and densities have been led by the proposed character areas in the MKEDF and the work in the LVIA.

#### *Design and layout*

- 8.164 This design work has established the indicative masterplan, split across four parameter plans to be approved for the site. These cover land use, movement and access, green infrastructure, and building heights. The parameters set out in these plans are supported by the Council's Urban Design officer.
- 8.165 Ultimately the parameter plans do differ from the indicative concept plan established in the MKEDF to a certain degree. These changes include, for example, moving the

secondary school, playing fields and the first primary school closer to the community hub, and moving the other primary schools on the site accordingly to maintain the catchment areas. However, the road layout established in the MKEDF is very similar to that proposed in the Parameter Plans and the quantum of land uses remains as required, and established in the land use sections, above.

- 8.166 The Council's Landscape Architect has expressed concern with the Building Heights Parameters Plan, considering the annotations too open ended with regard to setting maximum heights, and, as an example, further annotation should set the mix of tallest buildings per area. In addition, concern has been raised by the Landscape Architect and CBC that the building heights in the employment areas are too high, and would cause an urbanising effect on the character of the area, and that the heights along the entire eastern perimeter of the site should be reduced to create to preserve the more rural character. The majority of the eastern edge is set at up to 2.5 storeys, with two areas up to 4 storeys near the community hub and adjacent to the proposed park & ride.
- 8.167 As above, the applicant has agreed to further survey work to inform the design code. While the Council's Landscape Architect has suggested that the building heights parameters plan should not be agreed, it is considered that more detailed limits can be set through the design codes. This would allow the design codes to be the control on building heights, and ultimately through the reserved matters applications (as scale is a reserved matter). Through each reserved matters parcel the applicant will have to show compliance and consideration of the context for each parcel in relation to the standards set out in the design codes. The Council's Urban Design Officer has no objections to the proposal, subject to the design codes being secured by condition.
- 8.168 With these Parameter Plans secured, to establish the principle of the different features of the development, further design work, through submission of design codes, will be required to establish the details of the character areas. This would include further refinement of building heights, densities, street types, built form, frontages, boundary treatments, the proposed palette of materials and the location of feature buildings. The Design Codes will also guide the design of the landscape, including how it will be integrated into the streetscene and other highways infrastructure.
- 8.169 In particular, the Landscape Architect has noted the need for the design codes to establish the principle of street trees and the balance of parking standards and other requirements with good amenity. Other issues that need to be established through the Design Codes include the need for the proposed landscaping and green infrastructure to not be reduced or compromised through constraints on density, highways adoption and parking standards. To this end, it has been suggested that the phasing plan set the number of homes to be delivered at each phase, tested against the layout in order to provide sufficient tree-lined streets. However, at this stage it would be inflexible to set the housing numbers for each phase, as the detailed design work will come forward through the reserved matters stages, guided by the Design Codes.

8.170 To that end Design Codes for the site will be required by condition to secure these details and to subsequently guide the design of the development through the reserved matters phases.

8.171 It is acknowledged that the proposal will have an urbanising effect on an area that is currently almost completely rural. However, with the Parameter Plans and Design Codes secured, it is considered that the proposal will ultimately deliver a high quality development which has a positive impact on character, mitigating the urbanising effect where possible and providing a cohesive community, established along sustainable principles and shaped by green infrastructure. The application therefore complies with policies SD1, SD12, NE5, D1, D2 and D3 and D5 in this regard.

#### Residential amenity and living conditions

8.172 Policy D5 of Plan:MK states that all proposals will be required to create and protect a good standard of amenity for buildings and surrounding areas, whilst also ensuring that external private or shared communal garden space, in its extent and design, meets the reasonable needs of its users. The New Residential Development Design Guide SPD (NRDDG) provides guidance on matters such as rear to rear and rear to flank distances and the size requirements for private and shared amenity areas.

8.173 Policy HN4 requires all residential proposals to comply with the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) and good internal and external design which can be adapted to accommodating changing household needs.

8.174 Policy NE6 requires developments to have an acceptable impact on future occupiers and neighbours in relation to issues including noise and environmental pollution.

#### *Future occupants*

8.175 The application has been assessed with regard to the impact of noise, odour and air quality on the living conditions of future occupiers via the ES. It concludes that the impacts from routine operation of the Cotton Valley Wastewater Recycling Centre will not adversely affect future occupiers. Additionally, the positioning of the employment areas closest to the wastewater recycling centre, with residential areas further away, will further mitigate any potential impacts regarding residential amenity. This conclusion is agreed with the Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) noting that this zone equates to 194 metres into the site. This can be controlled through the Land Use Parameters Plans, which show this area in employment use.

8.176 In term of noise and vibration, noise barriers have been proposed between residential areas and the grid roads/M1 to reduce the impact of road traffic noise on future occupants. Each residential parcel is set back from the road, and landscape planting along the roads will further reduce any impact. Ultimately this arrangement is similar to the other grid squares in Milton Keynes, and the impact from noise would be similar. Air Quality has been assessed and the applicant has found the impacts to be

negligible in terms of the increase resulting from traffic and the built up areas, and this is agreed by the EHO

- 8.177 In terms of potential contamination, the site has been predominantly in agricultural use, and has been assessed, with the conclusion that there is a low likelihood of contamination on the site. With appropriate conditions for testing of excavated material and reporting on any unexpected contamination (standard conditions required the EHO) it is considered that there will be no risk to human health through contaminated land. The EA have noted the presence of superficial secondary aquifers and the existing status of the site as undeveloped agricultural land, therefore not presenting a high pollution potential.
- 8.178 It is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of impact from noise and environmental pollution on future occupiers and the proposal accords with Policy NE6 and HN4 in this regard.
- 8.179 All other future living conditions for occupants of the new development, such as the layout of the houses for privacy, overshadowing, visual intrusion, and the internal space standards provided per property, are a matter for the reserved matters applications. They will come forward with the scale, layout, appearance and landscaping of the future development parcels. The applicant will need to ensure that the reserved matters applications fulfil the requirements of the policy environment at the time (in regard to those matters which can be assessed at the reserved matters stage), which at present would require accordance with Policies D5 and HN4 and the NDSS.

*Existing occupants/construction phase*

- 8.180 With regard to the residential amenity of the existing nearby occupiers of the site, including future users of the Holiday Inn hotel, the main impacts are likely to come from the construction period, dependent on the location and the phase of development being worked on. The concerns regarding these impacts relate to noise, traffic and vibrations from construction, as well as Air Quality issues such as dust from building works. In general, as supported by the EHO, these will be controlled through the Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP), which will secure routes, compound locations and construction hours, amongst other requirements. It is considered appropriate and necessary to require an updated CEMP to be submitted for the highways infrastructure works and with each reserved matters phase, given the size of the site and the likely necessity of moving compound and storage areas during construction.
- 8.181 Any other impacts from the development, in terms of layout and the scale of the adjacent proposals to existing residences, would be considered in detail at the reserved matters phases. This would be guided through the Parameters Plans approved as part of this application, and Design Codes secured by condition.



- 8.182 The houses in closest proximity to the development will be the cluster of nine homes at Pyms Stables, off the A509 at the northern boundary of the site. The surrounding residential parcel has been specified within the Land Use Parameters Plan as a zone in which *“all new habitable room windows are 44 metres or more from existing habitable room windows at Pyms Stables”*. This distance is twice the current back-to-back distance set out in the NRDDG. Additionally, the building heights of the residential parcels in the areas outside of the Community Hub and away from the urban edge are set in the Parameters Plan as up to 4 storeys. Scale and appearance are ultimately reserved matters and the building heights of those new homes closest to Pyms Stables can be lower, should it be found necessary for amenity reasons for the existing occupiers. These limits on heights and distance will be secured via the approved parameters plan, and therefore required to be replicated within the design codes and the reserved matters application(s) for this parcel. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal will not impact the privacy of the existing occupiers at Pyms Stables, nor will the proposed development cause any overshadowing or loss of daylight.
- 8.183 Additionally, given this distance of 44 metres, while construction noise is likely to be heard for the period of the houses being built closest to the residents, this impact will be temporary. As above, construction hours will be secured through the CEMP required for each phase of development, and temporary noise barriers can be required if considered necessary at the time.
- 8.184 In terms of residents in Willen, the impacts from the construction phase for highway works at Tongwell Street, and the associated stopping up of Carlton Gate, have been raised as a main concern. A noise barrier is proposed between Willen and Tongwell Street and will be required prior to the works to Tongwell Street, in order to minimise impacts. Again, hours will be controlled through the CEMP and therefore the impacts will be limited to the short construction period and mitigated where possible.
- 8.185 In the long term it is unlikely that the noise impacts from the new highway will be so significant as to cause increased noise and disturbance when compared to the background noise from Tongwell Street at present, or the M1. In terms of longer-term impacts from increased traffic through these junctions, the noise barriers have been proposed as permanent features to mitigate any potential affects, and appropriate landscaping will be required, as secured by condition.
- 8.186 Additional concerns have been raised regarding Aldrich Drive being used as a rat-run to access the southern area of Willen, given that Carlton Gate will be stopped up. As discussed above in the highways section of this report, this new arrangement is unlikely to cause significant additional noise impacts, as this is already the main road through Willen and there are already speed control features to reduce speeds.
- 8.187 With regards to the residents of Moulsoe the main concern relates to noise and vibration related to construction and construction traffic. Securing the CEMPs by conditions will ensure that construction vehicles are not routed through Moulsoe. While some noise impacts from the construction are inevitable, particularly for the parcels closer to the village; as above, noise will be mitigated through the installation

of noise barriers along residential frontages with new grid roads. These barriers will be secured to be installed prior to commencement on the residential parcels. Therefore, the impacts of noise will be somewhat mitigated for the residents of Moulsoe during construction of the built form. With the noise barriers and CEMP secured by condition it is considered that the construction impacts of the development have been mitigated as much as possible for these existing residents.

- 8.188 In addition, the long-term visual amenity of residents of Moulsoe will be protected as much as possible through the landscaping and boundary treatments along the eastern edge of the development. This will be dealt with through the reserved matters phases for landscaping, and conditions for the landscaping scheme around the highways infrastructure. However, there is extensive landscaping proposed, in particular, around the new junction with Newport Road, as well as the open space community orchard, allotments and burial grounds, and school playing fields at different points along the eastern perimeter.
- 8.189 Overall, the impact on existing residents through the construction and occupation phases of the development is considered to have been mitigated as much as reasonably possible and will primarily be limited to the construction phase, rather than the long-term occupation of the site. It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with Policies D5 and NE6 in terms of mitigating the impacts of the development on residential amenity.
- 8.190 Policy HN11 sets out that the Travellers' site at Willen Road, outside the application site to the west, will be safeguarded. The parcel of development land closest to the Traveller's' site is identified as either residential or employment use, up to four storeys, and is proposed to include a noise barrier between the new development and the Travellers' site. This will go towards safeguarding the occupants of the pitches from temporary noise during the construction phase and operational noise depending on the type of employment use that might be proposed on this parcel. Given that this land could end up in industrial use, it would be appropriate to secure a condition for a noise assessment for these flexible parcels, should they come forward in employment use, to ensure the area is appropriate for the type of use proposed, and to make any mitigation enhancements where necessary. As above, final details and implementation of all the noise barriers will be secured by condition. In addition, the parameter plans show a sufficient distance between the travellers' site and the new development to reduce the impact, in either direction, in terms of impact on privacy, overshadowing or visual intrusion. This can be further assessed and secured through the design code for the overall site. It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with Policy HN11 of Plan:MK.

#### Impact on heritage assets and archaeology

- 8.191 Policy HE1 of Plan:MK states that proposals will be supported where they sustain and, where possible, enhance the significance of the heritage assets recognised as being of historic, archaeological, architectural, artistic, landscape or townscape significance. These assets include conservation areas, listed buildings and non-designated heritage

assets as defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF. Where appropriate, the policy dictates that development proposals must provide an impartial and objective heritage assessment where there may be an impact on heritage assets.

- 8.192 The policy also requires that proposals, which cause less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, only be granted where the harm is demonstrably outweighed by public benefits delivered by the scheme. Regarding harm to non-designated heritage assets, the policy states that proposals incurring such harm will be resisted unless the need for, and benefits of the development clearly outweigh the harm, taking into account the asset's significance and importance, and only once all feasible solutions to avoid and mitigate that harm have been fully considered.
- 8.193 The policy notes that several considerations are to be taken into account when assessing any potential harm or enhancement to the significance of a heritage asset(s). This includes the cumulative impact of the development, respecting character and retaining architectural features and historic form of the asset(s).
- 8.194 Furthermore, in accordance with Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the PLBCA Act), special regard must be paid to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest in which it possesses. Also, in accordance with Section 72 of the PLBCA Act, special attention must also be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.
- 8.195 In addition, Policy DS6 requires that any development proposals in the linear parks contribute to *“protecting and interpreting areas of archaeological interest”*. Policy SD12 and the MKEDF note the importance of the scheme being informed by appropriate archaeology and heritage surveys, and the need for the development to protect the character of Moulsoe and not adversely affect the setting of the heritage assets within or at the edge of the site.
- 8.196 The application has been supplemented with a heritage statement which evaluates the significance of these heritage assets and articulates what the impact of the proposed development would be on the assets.

*Designated and non-designated heritage assets*

- 8.197 The applicant has assessed the heritage assets within the ES for this proposal and concluded that the assets that would be affected include the Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse (Holiday Inn); the listed buildings and non-designated assets within Moulsoe; and Campbell Park, in terms of distant views of the site.
- 8.198 This conclusion is supported by the Council's Conservation Officer, who has no objection to the principle of the development but agrees with the applicant's assessment that the application would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated and non-designated assets noted above, therefore resulting in an objection on heritage grounds. Historic England wish to make no

comments on the proposals, while The Gardens Trust note the likely long and panoramic views of the site from Campbell Park.

- 8.199 For the avoidance of doubt, the heritage assets west of the M1, which are close to the areas of highway works on and around Tongwell Street, are not considered to be affected by this proposal - neither the assets themselves nor their setting.
- 8.200 While not significant enough to fully mitigate the harm to Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse, the downgrading of the A509 and the indicative landscaping around the hotel would partially offset the impact of the development. The Council's Conservation Officer has also noted that the final layout of the built form will need to consider the impact on assets affected, particularly the Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse, as the development will surround it, and the layout along the eastern boundary, given its proximity and impact on the assets within Moulsoe. The parameters plans have established and secured the indicative green buffers between the site and Moulsoe, as well as the lower building heights on the eastern boundary, particularly in the south-eastern parcel close to Moulsoe. Ultimately, the layout, scale and appearance of these built-up areas will be dealt with as part of the reserved matters applications.
- 8.201 Similarly, The Gardens Trust has suggested that no building "*taller than general height*" be permitted, and that the development is further broken up through tree planting. These aspects can further be controlled through design code submissions and the reserved matters applications.
- 8.202 As above, where less than substantial harm has been identified to heritage assets the decision maker must take into account the wider public benefit of the proposal, which should only be permitted where the public benefit demonstrably outweighs this harm.
- 8.203 In this regard, the wider public benefits of the scheme include the provision of housing, the delivery of strategic urban extension and delivering housing to meet future housing need to 2031 and beyond. The benefits of policy compliant amount of affordable housing and the associated community facilities and infrastructure that accompanies the proposal, and the additional employment floorspace and accompanying jobs and economic development that would be associated with this also weigh in favour of the proposal. In addition, the creation of the new linear park is considered to be significant positive in favour of the proposal, as are the other landscape features proposed and the wider improvements to highway, pedestrian and cycle networks provided and/or funded as part of this development.
- 8.204 As above, harm has been identified as less than substantial, with minimal impact on the settings of heritage assets, including views from assets in Moulsoe, views from Campbell Park, or impact on the setting of the Holiday Inn building, though the final layout of adjacent parcels will need to be carefully considered. Overall, it is considered that the public benefits of the proposal will outweigh the less than substantial harm to the heritage assets, and that there is clear and convincing justification for the less

than substantial harm caused. In addition, this harm can be mitigated as much as possible through the reserved matters submissions.

- 8.205 The proposal is therefore considered to accord with Policies HE1, SD12 and the MKEDF in this regard, as well as the LPA's duty under the PLBCA Act.

#### *Archaeology*

- 8.206 Extensive discussions have occurred between the Council's Archaeologist and the applicant to identify areas which require excavation because of their archaeological potential. Most notably this includes an area on the eastern bank of the River Ouzel between the river and the A509. This area has been shown on the Land Use Parameter Plans as either housing or open space (i.e. retained as part of the linear park) depending on what is found through further excavations. The Council's Archaeologist has recommended conditions for a Written Scheme of Investigation for the remaining archaeological works to be undertaken. This Scheme would include a programme of public outreach and post-excavation analysis and publication where appropriate. In addition to complying with Policy HE1, this would ensure that a scheme is put in place which enhance archaeological areas within the linear parks, in accordance with Policy DS6.
- 8.207 Additionally, an area to the west of the site, near Willen Road, has been identified as having likely Iron Age to Roman activity, which has been agreed to remain in situ and requires fencing to be excluded from any construction. Again, this can be controlled by condition.
- 8.208 With conditions for a WSI and the fencing of the safeguarded archaeological areas identified, it is considered that the proposal accords with Policy HE1 and DS6 with regard to protecting and enhancing archaeological assets.

#### Landscape

- 8.209 Policies D1, D2 and D5 of Plan:MK require new development to incorporate hard and soft landscaping which reflects the verdant character of Milton Keynes and contributes towards the character and appearance of the development.
- 8.210 Policies NE4 and L4 seek to ensure that new development contributes towards the creation of green infrastructure. In addition, proposals should provide sufficient open space. Policy DS6 requires that any development proposals in the linear parks contribute to "*protecting and improving the landscape and features of nature conservation value.*"
- 8.211 Landscape is largely a reserved matter and therefore the details of the landscaping in relation to the built form, individual plots and buildings, and the ancillary open space features, will be secured at reserved matters stages. However, as above, it is considered that the provision of green infrastructure has been well thought out and provided in accordance or in excess of the policy requirements in terms of the

provision of the linear park, playing fields, local and neighbourhood play, allotments, community orchard and burial grounds, as discussed in the community uses section of this report. The Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan sets out an appropriate baseline for the delivery of a comprehensive landscaping scheme, which can be further refined through work on the Design Codes and secured through reserved matters applications.

- 8.212 While details of the landscape will be forthcoming, it is considered necessary, and policy compliant, to ensure that landscape management and maintenance plans are submitted with all reserved matters applications that relate to landscaping. This can be secured by condition.
- 8.213 In relation to the landscaping within the highways infrastructure, the Council's Tree Officer has asked for final details of the proposed tree planting to be required by condition, to establish the tree planting along the strategic highway corridors. Alongside the discussion on trees in the Ecology section below, it is considered that an appropriate landscaping scheme for the road corridors can be secured by condition.
- 8.214 In that regard, it is considered that an appropriate landscaping scheme can be delivered across the site, secured by conditions for the full element, and through the reserved matters submissions on the outline element of the scheme. The proposal therefore complies with Policies D1, D2 D5, NE4 and L4 in this regard.

#### Ecological impact and biodiversity gain

- 8.215 Policy NE1 of Plan:MK states that development proposals which would be likely to harm the biodiversity or geological conservation value of a site of countywide or local importance will only be permitted subject to satisfying criteria associated with the need for the development and the provision of suitable compensation and mitigation.
- 8.216 The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the Regulations) provide that in exercising any of its functions the Council must have regard to the aims of the Regulations so far as they may be affected by the exercise of those functions. In this case that would include the impact on protected species as set out below. Policy NE2 also states that, where there is a reasonable likelihood of the presence of statutorily protected species or their habitats, development will not be permitted unless it has been demonstrated that the proposed development will not result in a negative impact upon those species and habitats.
- 8.217 Policy NE3 seeks to ensure that development delivers a net increase in biodiversity where possible. It states that proposals providing in excess of 5 dwellings will be required to submit a BIAM to demonstrate any loss or gain of biodiversity. As a last resort, any loss of biodiversity may be compensated by a contribution towards providing improvements to biodiversity elsewhere in the Borough, although the policy states that this can only occur if the loss cannot be mitigated on-site or avoided entirely.

- 8.218 Policy NE4 states that green infrastructure will be “protected, extended and enhanced for its biodiversity, recreational, accessibility, health and landscape value and for the contribution it makes towards combating climate change.” Part E of the policy supports the extension of the linear park network in the urban extensions, which, among other criteria, would be strategically planned, meet the needs of existing and future residents, achieve net gains in biodiversity, connect with other green infrastructure and is managed in the long-term.
- 8.219 Paragraph 174 of the NPPF states that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should encourage opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity.

#### *Habitats and species*

- 8.220 There are no nationally or internationally designated wildlife sites within the application boundary, although there are Wildlife Corridor designations along the River Ouzel, Broughton Brook and M1 motorway. Through their survey work the applicant has also identified several mature trees at the site, and has identified 40 trees and two woodland groups as potentially veteran trees,, i.e. trees with veteran features that require further survey work to confirm whether they meet the classification as veteran trees. The applicant has also noted that there are ten areas of ancient Woodlands within 2 kms of the site.
- 8.221 In terms of the impact on habitats and protected species, the Council’s Countryside Officer has noted the requirement to undertake Phase 2 Bat Surveys, prior to the submission of reserved matters applications. Additionally, it is noted that, due to the duration of the build-out of the site, it is likely that updated Phase 2 species surveys for the other protected species identified on site will be required to be updated, as this is usually required if an up to date survey has not been undertaken within two years. This can be secured by condition, requiring the submission of the relevant species surveys with each reserved matters application, and requiring these to be up to date, i.e. less than 2 years old when submitted.
- 8.222 The Countryside Officer has requested that the standard avoidance of tree felling during the nesting bird season (March-September inclusive) is secured through the Construction Environmental Management Plan, as well as including reasonable avoidance measures with regard to small mammals and reptiles. This can be included as a requirement within the CEMP to be secured by condition. The Wildlife Trust have also noted the need to ensure that small mammals can pass unimpeded along the river bank during construction of the river crossings; these details can also be secured through the CEMP.
- 8.223 The Countryside Officer has also noted that the loss of farmland will result in a significant loss of habitat for farmland birds, as well as the loss of breeding habitats for birds and bats. This represents a significant loss in habitat and therefore both the Countryside Officer and the Wildlife Trust have recommended a mitigation strategy

for farmland bird habitat within the wider countryside should be secured, as mitigation will not be possible on site. In addition, integrated bird and bat boxes should be secured via a LEMP which should also include protective measures, as currently outlined in the ES. The LEMP can also ensure that any infrastructure features, such as the highways works, allow for continued access and movement of small mammals, for example, around the river bank.

8.224 A number of protected species have been identified on site through Phase 2 Protected Species Surveys and will require licences (under the separate licensing regime) if the final layout proposal require, for example the closure of any badger setts. Additionally, the applicant has been notified of the Great Crested Newt (GCN) District Licensing Scheme that operates within the borough, and has expressed interest in obtaining a District Licence. The scheme is voluntary, but the organisers of the scheme, NatureSpace UK, require certain conditions to be applied if the applicant is to operate under the District licence. As the licence has not yet been finalised, it is proposed to delegate the final wording to of the GCN licensing conditions to officers. If the applicant does not choose to obtain a District Licence then they will need to obtain a traditional Natural England licence instead, which does not need to be controlled by condition, and would resolve the licensing requirements in respect of GCNs.

8.225 With the further species surveys, CEMP and LEMP secured by conditions for the highways infrastructure aspects, and for submission with reserved matters phases, it is considered that the proposal will have fully considered protected species and habitats at each stage of the application.

*Woodland, hedgerow and trees*

8.226 With regard to the Ancient Woodland, the applicant has assessed air quality and nitrogen deposition in relation to increased traffic. In summary the change has been assessed to be less than 1% and which indicatively would not change or impact the types or varieties of species within these areas. It is therefore considered that these areas of Ancient Woodland would not be affected by the proposal, and the Council's EHO has agreed the impacts on air quality as negligible.

8.227 With regard to the potential veteran trees and established hedgerow, it should be noted that the NPPF states that development which results in the loss of irreplaceable habitats should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons to accept the loss and that the loss can be compensated for. The proposals will result in the loss of eleven trees that could be considered veteran. The Council's Countryside officer and Landscape Architect have expressed concern with the loss of potentially veteran trees, citing that it does not appear that wholly exceptional reasons have been provided for their loss. The Council's Tree Officer recognises that the layout of the residential areas and roads has been influenced by many factors which might outweigh the loss of a small number of potentially veteran trees. The Tree Officer has discussed these 11 trees with the applicants on site. There is a possibility of moving the trees within the site, using specialist contractors, and the Trees Officer notes that, while the tree is not



always guaranteed to survive, it may last many years before it fails and would remain as standing dead wood habitat for 10-20 years as it decays.

- 8.228 In addition the Landscape Architect raises concern with the caveats within the green infrastructure plan regarding the existing hedgerow to be retained, and recommends further survey work be completed to ensure the best hedgerow is retained. It is recommended that this requirement be included within the pre-commencement condition for an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) areas covered by the detailed application and for submission with the reserved matters applications for areas in outline.
- 8.229 It is therefore considered that for the potential veteran trees, which require removal for the highways infrastructure (full element of the scheme), a feasibility study and strategy for moving and/or retaining these trees on site should be required prior to commencement. This would be alongside the standard tree conditions requiring AMS, and tree protection for all trees and hedgerows to remain.
- 8.230 For the outline element of the scheme, each reserved matters parcel will require the submission of an AMS. Tree protection conditions, will also be required. The AMS would identify the potentially veteran trees, and show how they can be retained or, as a last resort moved on site. These conditions will ensure that all the trees within the reserved matters parcels are properly surveyed, and ultimately protected from any construction works, and incorporated into the landscape strategy for each parcel.
- 8.231 In this instance it is considered that the potential loss of these potential veteran trees can be accepted. There are exceptional reasons for the proposed layout of the site, given the need for the highways infrastructure to be logically located given the constraints at the site, and a strategy to move and replant the trees where feasible can be secured. This would be alongside the extensive replanting of trees at the site, as set out below.
- 8.232 The Tree Officer has also noted the presence of a group trees covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) along Tongwell Street, but clarifies that the trees present at the time of the order were within hedgerows and no longer appear to be on site, following the construction of Willen and Tongwell Street some time ago. Any concerns regarding trees in this location can be covered by the AMS condition as above and final landscaping details for the full element of the scheme.
- 8.233 The applicant's landscape strategy includes provision for the planting of 250,000 trees, including a community orchard to be known as Moulsoe New Wood, within the green infrastructure and tree lined streets to support the Council's strategic aims of planting significant numbers of trees. The planting of new orchards is supported by Natural England, with emphasis placed on increasing green connections across the site. The applicant has also proposed tree nurseries on site to establish these trees before planting, which is supported by the Tree Officer as a replication of the efforts of Milton Keynes Development Corporation, during the early years of Milton Keynes'

development. Any specifics of the types and species of the trees and planting will be required to be agreed as part of the reserved matters applications.

#### *Biodiversity gain*

- 8.234 New provision of open space and habitats at the site including the new linear park, green infrastructure linking connections along watercourses and between residential parcels, community orchard and the landscaped pocket parks and amenity space.
- 8.235 The applicants have undertaken a BIAM for the site based on the landscape strategy and concluded that at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity can be achieved, with the calculation currently showing 14.5% net gain across the site. This calculation is supported by natural England, though the Council's Countryside Officer and the Wildlife Trust have suggested some amendments to the calculation, expressing some doubt regarding the SuDS features being included in the calculation, as they are not primarily wildlife habitats, and the likelihood of grassland along paths, allotments and SuDS basins being able to be maintained as species rich features.
- 8.236 Nevertheless, it is considered that the scheme would be able to achieve a net gain in biodiversity across the site, and the Countryside Officer has recommended that the overarching strategy for net gain (with an updated BIAM) be secured by condition. This has been requested alongside detailed Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy (BES) proposals to be submitted for each reserved matters application. It is therefore proposed to secure a BES, to include an updated BIAM, as part of any reserved matters submission, to ensure a net gain in biodiversity is delivered with every phase of development, in accordance with the policy environment and best practice at the time.
- 8.237 With the overarching strategy secured, and the requirement to update this scheme as part of each reserved matters application it is considered that a net gain in biodiversity will be delivered at the site.

#### *Conclusion*

- 8.238 With the above conditions secured it is considered that the proposal will effectively minimise the impact on habitats and protected species, mitigate these impacts where necessary and overall demonstrate and provide a net gain in biodiversity at the site in accordance with Policies NE1 to NE4 and the NPPF.

#### Drainage and flood risk

- 8.239 Policy FR1 of Plan:MK states that all new development must incorporate a surface water drainage system with acceptable flood control and demonstrate that water supply, foul sewerage and sewage treatment capacity is available, or can be made available, to serve the development.

- 8.240 Policy FR2 requires new development to incorporate SuDS as a means of managing surface water drainage. Policy DS6 requires that any development proposals in the linear parks contribute to achieving flood control.
- 8.241 Policy FR3 requires that all new development be set back 8 metres from any mains rivers, or 9 metres from ordinary watercourses, unless another distance is agreed with the EA, LLFA or IDB. This Policy also resists any proposal that would “would adversely affect the natural functioning of main rivers, ordinary watercourses and wet or dry balancing lakes.”
- 8.242 NPPF paragraphs 161 to 163 require that developments undertake a sequential test with regard to development within areas of flood risk requiring that an assessment is made as to whether there are any available sites which are reasonably appropriate for the proposed development in an area with a lower risk of flooding. If the sequential test finds that a lower risk area is not available, the exception test may be applied, depending on the development type and its comparative vulnerability. The exception test requires that the development demonstrates that there would be wider sustainability benefits that outweigh the risk and that the development would be safe, will not increase flood risk elsewhere, and where possible, reduce overall flood risk.
- 8.243 In addition paragraphs 167 and 169 require that flood risk is not increased elsewhere and that major developments incorporate sustainable drainage systems, with long term management and maintenance secured.

*Flood risk and development location*

- 8.244 The site is mostly in Flood Zone 1, with areas around the River Ouzel in Flood Zones 2 and 3. The majority of the built form is within Flood Zone 1. Flood Zone 2 contains some built form which is appropriate in Flood Zone 2 (ie, less vulnerable development) and development in Flood Zone 3 only includes highways infrastructure, which is classed as essential infrastructure, and considered acceptable in Flood Zone 3 provided the development meets the sequential and exception tests.
- 8.245 The applicant has undertaken a sequential test for this infrastructure and, as a crossing of the river is required in some location, any other location would inevitably also be in Flood Zone 3. There is therefore no sequentially preferable location for these highway works. On this basis the sequential test is accepted for the development in Flood Zone 3, roads which need are classed as ‘Essential Infrastructure’ this requires the application of the exception test.
- 8.246 The drainage scheme for all of the highways infrastructure has been designed to be above a level affected by a the 1 in 100 year, plus 35% climate event, and the drainage scheme incorporates mitigation to ensure no increased risk of flooding elsewhere. This will allow for continued road access throughout the development in the event of flooding. On this basis it is considered that the exception test has been met.

- 8.247 Flood risk modelling has been carried out and assessed by the EA, with a conclusion that ultimately flood risk will not be increased on or off site, provided a condition for the finalisation of the flood model at Moulsoe Brook is secured.
- 8.248 AW have commented that they have assets within the development site, including a pumping station and that a 15 metre buffer should be maintained around any such assets for access and future residential amenity. This would be controlled by AW and will be included as an informative.

#### *Drainage scheme*

- 8.249 A strategic site wide drainage system has been designed for the development which sets out how the scheme will operate in the long-term across both the full and outline elements, as well as temporary measures during construction. The Lead Local Flood Authority is satisfied with the outline drainage strategy, with regard to maintaining appropriate runoff rates and managing surface water via SuDS, with priority given to above ground storage features where possible.
- 8.250 Each reserved matters parcel will be required to provide an acceptable drainage scheme to comply with the strategic site wide scheme, and to this end the LLFA have suggested a number of conditions to deal with the various stages of the scheme. This includes a detailed strategy for each reserved matters parcel, submission of proformas, details during construction, and a scheme for verification of the implemented drainage. These will be secured by condition.
- 8.251 The IDB has suggested various conditions to ensure that they are consulted regarding the drainage scheme for the site where it affects the ordinary watercourses under their control. While the principle of these conditions is supported, the wording has been amended from their suggested conditions to ensure that the conditions meet the tests for conditions outlined in the NPPF. The additional consent of the IDB, for any discharge or impacts to their watercourses, will be required through their separate consent regime.
- 8.252 In relation to the full proposal for highways infrastructure, the applicant has provided detailed drainage plans and calculations to ensure that flood risk is not increased on or off site. While the LLFA are unable to recommend approval as further discussion is required with highways colleagues regarding the drainage in relation to the highways infrastructure. However informal discussions are ongoing and in anticipation of agreement being reached, the LLFA have suggested a number of conditions to cover both the detailed design of the highways drainage, the long-term maintenance, and drainage during construction. The LLFA have confirmed that this would require a suitable scheme to be provided.
- 8.253 AW have no objections to the surface water drainage scheme, as their assets are not affected.

### *Rivers and watercourses*

8.254 In order to comply with Policy FR3 the applicant has allowed for the appropriate setback of development from the main river and ordinary watercourses. These setbacks will be required by separate regulation and proposed to be included as an informative = on future development parcels. The IDB have reiterated this requirement in their response to the application, and noted that this includes any planting, fencing or other landscaping within the 9 metre buffer, without their consent. It is anticipated that the IDB and EA will be consulted on future reserved matters parcels which directly relate to their assets.

### *Other water issues*

8.255 The EA considers that there is sufficient capacity within the system for foul water flows, and AW have confirmed that the Cotton Valley Water Recycling Centre has available capacity for foul drainage flows, whilst noting that the development would lead to an increased risk of flooding without intervention, via drainage scheme and new infrastructure. They state that they will need to work with the applicant to deliver infrastructure improvements as the development comes forward. To that end they have requested conditions for a phasing plan (in order to anticipate required infrastructure improvements) and details of the foul water drainage works to be agreed. These conditions will be secured.

8.256 With regard to the sustainability of water use, the EA have expressed that it is disappointing that the applicant has failed to recognise that the area is subject to water stress, and that with water resources a key issue, AW should continue to be consulted to ensure infrastructure is put in place to growth needs can be met. To that end the EA supports the target of increasing water efficiency through the design and construction of the development, in accordance with Policy SC1. Updated sustainability statements will be required by condition, see Sustainable Construction section below, to ensure these standards are carried through to reserved matter stages through the lifetime of the development.

### *Conclusion*

8.257 With the above conditions secured, the proposal has adequately considered flood risk in terms of the location of the built form and design of features. It has put forward an appropriate drainage scheme that takes into account the long-term and short-term mitigation required to ensure that flood risk is not increased on or off site. It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with Policies FR1, FR2, FR3, SC1 and NE6 as well as national guidance on flood risk, and paras 161-163 and 167 of the NPPF, with regard to flood risk and drainage.

### Sustainable construction

8.258 Policy SC1 sets out the principles and requirements with regard to the sustainability of materials, waste, energy, climate and water. In particular, the policy requires

development proposals for 11 dwellings or more to submit an Energy and Climate Statement that demonstrates how the proposal will achieve certain reductions in carbon via the use of materials (19%) and the implementation of renewable energies (20%). The policy also requires that any residual carbon emissions are addressed via a contribution to the Council's carbon offset fund.

- 8.259 Part B of Policy SC2 states that proposals of this size should consider the integration of community energy networks, and that low carbon and renewable energy generation will be supported, provided there are no significant negative impacts. Policy SC3 supports low carbon and renewable energy generation which meets the needs of local communities.
- 8.260 The emerging Sustainable Construction SPD can be afforded significant weight in the consideration of this application, as it is in the latter stages of being adopted. The SPD provides further details in support of Policy SC1 for example in terms of reducing carbon output of development and calculating carbon offsetting, and the Council's Development Plans (Sustainability) Officer has considered the SPD in comments on this application.
- 8.261 The applicant has submitted an Outline Energy Statement, Sustainability Statement and Overheating Mitigation Strategy to provide an in principle approach to matters of sustainability. It includes an agreement to fabric first approach to increase energy efficiency, consideration of mechanical ventilation and passive design to prevent overheating, and an aim for each new home to include air source heat pumps, rather than connection to a community energy network, with consideration of green roofs and solar panels to take place at the reserved matters stage. The Council's Development Plans (Sustainability) Officer has no concerns with this approach as Policy SC2 requires only *consideration* of a community energy network, and if alternatively proposals are more feasible for the site and achieve the same aims of renewable energy generation for every home and building, then the proposal can be supported.
- 8.262 The applicant has confirmed that the development will meet the carbon reduction standards set out with Policy SC1 Part K, given the future building regulations requirements coming into force, while any surplus carbon emissions can be offset through the S106 agreement.
- 8.263 While the in principle aims set out within the applicant's above statements, the final design work to ensure these sustainability standards have been met will only be able to be fully considered as a part of the detailed design of the buildings at the reserved matters stages. Therefore, it is considered appropriate to apply a condition to require each subsequent phase of development to provide an updated statement and scheme with regard to sustainability. This would include compliance with the latest policy and standards, to ensure the provision of energy efficient buildings, and low carbon energy generation wherever possible.

- 8.264 Parts K5 and K6 of Policy SC1 require that a monitoring scheme for sustainability be secured which would assess the energy use, indoor air quality, and overheating risk for 10% of the proposed dwellings for the first five years of their occupancy, as well as calculating the homes as built performance. This can be secured by conditions.
- 8.265 With the conditions above secured and the remaining carbon offsetting, and monitoring secured via the S106 agreement, it is considered that the proposal complies with Policies SC1, SC2 and SC3 in providing an energy efficient, sustainable development.

### Other matters

#### *Waste*

- 8.266 Policy WC3 of the Waste Development Plan Document requires new build developments to efficiently use resources, both through effective design for recycling, storage and collection during occupation and for minimising use of aggregates through construction and encouraging use of recycled building materials. Additionally, Policy SC1 considers the need to reduce waste during construction and through the life of developments.
- 8.267 The MKEDF requires a 2 hectare site to be provided for the provision of a HWRC, either adjacent to the proposed park and ride, on Council owned land to the north east, or within the employment area.. The MKEDF states that this could come forward on a number of locations, within the applicant's employment area on this site or within the Council owner land to the north-east. There is therefore no absolute requirement to provide the HWRC on this site, though its provision will be secured through the S106 as a site if required.
- 8.268 The applicant has submitted a chapter on waste as part of the Environmental Statement that deals with waste generated from the construction of the site. There will not be a significant amount of demolition and the applicant has stated that this will be reused where possible and that other construction waste will be managed on site in accordance with waste hierarchy principals. In order to ensure the appropriate handling of waste during the construction period it is considered appropriate to require by condition that a Site Waste Management Plan be submitted with each reserved matters application. Alongside the submissions of a Construction Environmental Management Plan, this will ensure the appropriate consideration of the localised construction impacts as part of each phase of development.
- 8.269 In terms of waste generated from occupied development, the provision of bin stores and storage will be assessed and considered as part of the reserved matters applications. Nevertheless, the applicant's Sustainability Statement has emphasised the aim to foster greater levels of recycling. Each reserved matters submission will be required, as above, to be submitted with an updated Sustainability Statement to show how waste has been reduced in accordance with the current policy at the time. It is

considered that waste generated from occupied development can be considered at that time.

#### *Digital and telecommunications*

- 8.270 Policy CT9 supports the provision of superfast broadband speeds and future-proofing services for ultra-fast speeds for all new residents and businesses. Policy DS3 states that; “The supply of superfast broadband to all employment and residential premises will be promoted to increase the attractiveness of the Borough as a business location and to increase opportunities for home and flexible working.” Policy D8 states that all telecommunications services should be provided underground.
- 8.271 The applicant has stated that all new premises will provide at least superfast broadband provision (>24Mb) with future proofing for ultrafast provision (>300Mb). With this secured by condition the proposal is considered to comply with polices CT9 and DS3 in this regard.
- 8.272 It is also recommended that a compliance condition be applied to the outline permission to require all new electricity and telecommunications services be provided underground, unless there is a proven reason why this cannot be achieved. With this secured the proposal will comply with Policy D8.

#### *Safety and security*

- 8.273 Policy D1, Part 4, states that the layout of new development “should maximise the surveillance of the public realm, prevention of crime and minimise the perception of crime.” Policy SD1 requires that strategic urban extensions consider place-making principles including passive surveillance and active frontages to create places that are safe, and perceived to be safe, and that private spaces are secure. Policy CT3 supports safe walking and cycle routes, and the provision of secure cycle parking. Policy EH7 states that proposal should create safe residential environments and address “the fear and perception of crime.”
- 8.274 The MKEDF, at para 4.6.11, states that “developers should follow best practice guidance in ‘Secured by Design’ to design out opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour.”
- 8.275 It is therefore recommended that all new development be built with Secured By Design best practice principles considered. While in the past the LPA has required new developments to provide certification of achieving Secured by Design accreditation on new developments, it is considered more appropriate to flexibly word a condition to require development to be built in accordance with Secured by Design principles or a subsequent regime. The easiest way for an applicant to achieve approval under this condition would likely be through Secure by Design accreditation. Wording a condition in this way would allow for more flexibility and meet the six tests in the NPPF. Relying on a consent regime outside the planning process would not be consistent with policy



and the NPPF, as there is no express requirement to achieve Secure by Design accreditation in local or national policy.

- 8.276 With an appropriately worded condition secured, and the appropriate design and layout considerations undertaken at the reserved matters stages, it is considered that the proposal would comply with the above-mentioned policies in providing a safe and secure new development.

#### Infrastructure impacts and S106 matters

- 8.277 Policy INF1 of Plan:MK seeks to ensure that the necessary on and off-site infrastructure required to support and mitigate the impact of development is either already in place, or that there is a reliable mechanism in place to ensure that it is delivered. Part E of Policy INF1 allows for a number of developments in close proximity, where 'the Council will seek voluntary agreements from developers to contribute towards the costs of jointly required infrastructure, therefore improving the acceptability of the development, reducing the need for statutory S106 contributions and enhancing the attractiveness of the development to potential buyers.'
- 8.278 Policy CC1 requires that 0.5% of the gross development cost of proposals for 11 or more dwellings be allocated towards cultural wellbeing, including public art. Policy SC1 requires that any residual carbon emissions are addressed via a contribution to the Council's carbon offset fund.
- 8.279 Policy EH5 states that all new residential development proposals will only be permitted where they provide or improve essential facilities and services required to serve the scale of the development proposed. In addition, Policy EH6 requires that all Use Class C3 residential development in excess of 50 dwellings will be required to prepare a HIA to measure the wider impact on healthy living and the demands that are placed upon the capacity of health services and facilities arising from the development.
- 8.280 Policy SD9 of Plan:MK covering the general principles for strategic urban extensions requires 'planning obligations relating to the phasing of development and the provision of on-site and off-site infrastructure and facilities, to include land, capital and initial running costs'.
- 8.281 Policy SD12 which specifically covers the Milton Keynes East strategic urban extension contains more detail on the range of infrastructure required to be delivered to support the new development. This includes 'primary and secondary education, community facilities, health, retail and local services' along with 'the phased introduction of a comprehensive network of transport infrastructure'.
- 8.282 Section 5 of the MKEDF deals with Infrastructure Delivery and determines that contributions toward the costs of infrastructure delivery will be sought from individual S106 Agreements. These would sit underneath an overarching Tariff Framework

Agreement (TFA) and that each of the landowners and/or lead developers within the MKE allocation will sign up to these.

- 8.283 The applicant has indicated that they will sign up to the TFA, and a S106 Agreement based on those terms, and discussions between respective solicitors are at an advanced stage.
- 8.284 The original Milton Keynes Tariff was devised to support the new eastern, western and strategic land urban extensions allocated in the 2005 Local Plan. It raises funding for infrastructure provision on a per dwelling or per square metre basis. Funding generated from the Tariff mechanism supports the delivery of both local (largely on site) infrastructure, but also contributes to wider strategic infrastructure in acknowledgement of the impact that expansion area development on an MK scale has on infrastructure provided on a city- wide basis.
- 8.285 Since it became operational the MK Tariff has supported the delivery of 6 Primary Schools, 2 Secondary Schools and the all-through school under construction at Glebe Farm with two further Primary Schools to come in the Western Expansion Area. It has contributed to the two new Health Centres opened in recent years at Brooklands and Whitehouse and four new community and leisure facilities, as well as numerous parks, play areas and new allotments. It has further supported the provision of new bus services, community development and public art provision in the expansion areas.
- 8.286 On a strategic basis the Tariff has supported the delivery of the new Cancer Centre at MK University Hospital, the new galleries provision at the Milton Keynes Museum, the new Library provision at Kingston and Westcroft, the provision of the second chapel at the Crematorium, Ambulance facilities at the Blue Light Hub in Ashland and continues to support the development of the business case for MKU. Proposals to support further development at the Hospital and at the College are evolving and the Tariff continues to support the Council's Economic Development function.
- 8.287 Significant investments have also been made from the Tariff in the strategic highway network and during its lifetime Tariff funding has been provided for upgrade works at both Junction 13 and 14 of the M1, the Abbey Hill and Portway junctions on the A5 and several related junctions on the MK grid road network.
- 8.288 The original Tariff Programme was closed to new entrants in 2015 as a result of pooling restrictions introduced in CIL regulations at that time. The pooling restrictions have subsequently been revoked meaning that a comparable Tariff mechanism can now be introduced to cater for the urban extensions allocated in Plan MK.
- 8.289 In order to maintain consistency and fairness across the various development areas it is proposed that the Tariff for MKE is set in line with that currently being paid in the '2005' expansion areas which continue to build out. As of June 2021 that equates to approximately £28k per dwelling and £82.50 per square metre of employment land development (original Tariff rate was £18.5k per dwelling and employment rate was variable). Rates continue to attract indexation over time.

8.290 Assuming that the total quantum of development for MKE is delivered at June 2021 rates this will provide approximately £180m of new infrastructure funding, more than £145m of which will come from this development, which will be applied to delivery of the required local on-site infrastructure but will also generate further funding to support the continuing enhancements and additions to the strategic infrastructure which supports the continuing growth of the city.

8.291 The table below sets out the funding that would be secured both from this development and from the wider MKE allocation under the Tariff mechanism. The actual funding generated will increase over time in line with indexation.

	This application (£'000)	MKE Allocation (£'000)
Highways	41,258	50,721
Sustainable Transport	11,479	13,908
Primary Education (inc. Early Years)	18,138	22,672
Secondary Education (inc. Post 16)	18,568	23,210
Further Education	2,361	2,876
Higher Education	5,476	6,658
Primary and Community Healthcare	6,142	7,678
Acute Healthcare	8,150	10,188
Open Space and Play Areas	16,918	21,148
Community and Leisure Facilities	6,098	7,623
Social Care	2,212	2,765
Art, Culture and Community Development	1,671	2,038
Flood Alleviation	1,271	1,539
Carbon Offsetting	1,257	1,532
Inward Investment	1,271	1,539
Waste Management	822	1,028
Libraries and Lifelong Learning	701	877
Heritage	653	816
Emergency Services	530	650
Burial Grounds and Crematorium	436	545
<b>Total (June 2021 values)</b>	<b>145,412</b>	<b>180,011</b>

8.292 In addition to the funding secured through the Tariff mechanism, the S106 for the Berkeley/St James development will also secure around 80ha of land for the provision through an infrastructure delivery plan of new schools, health and community facilities, parks including the new linear 'river valley' park, play areas, playing fields and allotments.

- 8.293 The infrastructure delivery plan will also provide for the potential highway interventions required off site including providing for supporting future development of J14 of the M1 by National Highways and for the monitoring of compliance throughout the lifetime of the development with the Council's sustainability requirements set out in Local Plan Policy SC1.
- 8.294 With the contributions and obligations above secured it is considered that the proposal complies with Policies INF1, CC1, SC1, EH5, SD9, D12 and the MKEDF in providing the identified necessary infrastructure to support this development.

## **9.0 Conclusions**

- 9.1 On balance, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable for the many reasons outlined above. The proposed development would deliver very substantial and numerous benefits including the provision of housing within and beyond the Plan:MK plan period; accessible employment land; provision of a high-quality, well-designed new community, with support for pedestrians and cyclists, new infrastructure schools, health facilities, shops and other community uses; and mitigation for increased traffic through new roads, junction improvements and safeguarding for future sustainable transport. These benefits form part of the wider Plan strategy and aspirations for the Council's Strategy for 2050.
- 9.2 Controls on the development, through conditions, future reserved matters submissions, and clauses through the S106 agreement will ensure the provision of a policy compliant scheme, that is designed and delivered to a high standard. Contributions secured through the Tariff and S106 agreement will ensure off-site works and the mitigation from the impacts of the development are properly delivered in the appropriate timescales.
- 9.3 The above assessment set out in section 8 of this report is considered to amount to the LPAs Statement of Reasons under the EIA Regulations, with the conditions set out below in conjunction with the s106 obligations addressing the significant effects of the proposed development on the environment that are likely to arise as a result.
- 9.4 In conclusion it is recommended that permission be granted, as set out in section 1 of this report.
- 9.5 None of the other matters raised through the publicity and consultation process amount to material considerations outweighing the assessment of the main issues set out above, noting that conditions or obligations are recommended where meeting the tests for their imposition.
- 9.6 Where relevant, regard has been had to the public sector equality duty, as required by section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 and to local finance considerations (as far as it is material), as required by section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), as well as climate change and human rights legislation (including Article

8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol regarding the right of respect for a person's private and family life and home, and to the peaceful enjoyment of possessions).

## 10.0 Conditions

- The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the plans/drawings listed below, received 31/03/2021 unless otherwise stated, unless as otherwise required by condition attached to this permission or following approval of an application made pursuant to Section 96A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990:

Drawing Number	Rev.	Title	Received date
01312_S_100	P1	Site Location Plan	
<b>Parameter Plans for Outline Element</b>			
01312_PP_01	P2	Land Use Parameter Plan	10/09/2021
01312_PP_02	P2	Movement and Access Parameter Plan	10/09/2021
01312_PP_03	P2	Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan	10/09/2021
01312_PP_04	P3	Building Heights Parameter Plan	10/09/2021
<b>Detailed Highways, Bridges &amp; Structures, and Drainage Drawings</b>			
<b>Highways Drawings</b>			
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0010	P04	General Arrangement For Planning Schematic Overview	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0011	P05	General Arrangement For Planning Sheet 1	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0012	P05	General Arrangement For Planning Sheet 2	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0013	P06	General Arrangement For Planning Sheet 3	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0014	P06	General Arrangement For Planning Sheet 4	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0015	P06	General Arrangement For Planning Sheet 5	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0016	P05	General Arrangement For Planning Sheet 6	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0017	P05	General Arrangement For Planning Sheet 7	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0018	P05	General Arrangement For Planning Sheet 8	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0019	P06	General Arrangement For Planning Sheet 9	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0020	P06	General Arrangement For Planning Sheet 10	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0101	P06	Geometry Details of Indicative Cross Sections Sheet 1 of 4	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0102	P06	Geometry Details of Indicative Cross Sections Sheet 2 of 4	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0103	P04	Geometry Details of Indicative Cross Sections Sheet 3 of 4	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0104	P04	Geometry Details of Indicative Cross Sections Sheet 4 of 4	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0105	P02	Carriageway Construction Details	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2801	P02	Link 101 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2802	P03	Link 102 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2803	P04	Link 103 Long-Sections Sheet 1 of 3	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2804	P04	Link 103 Long-Sections Sheet 2 of 3	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2805	P04	Link 103 Long-Sections Sheet 3 of 3	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2806	P04	Link 104 Long-Sections	10/09/2021

<b>Drawing Number</b>	<b>Rev.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Received date</b>
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2807	P04	Link 105 Long-Sections Sheet 1 of 4	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2808	P04	Link 105 Long-Sections Sheet 2 of 4	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2809	P05	Link 105 Long-Sections Sheet 3 of 4	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2810	P04	Link 105 Long-Sections Sheet 4 of 4	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2811	P02	Link 107 Long-Sections Sheet 1 of 2	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2812	P04	Link 107 Long-Sections Sheet 2 of 2	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2813	P03	Link 108 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2816	P03	Link 110 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2817	P03	Link 301 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2818	P03	Link 302 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2819	P03	Link 303 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2820	P03	Link 304 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2821	P03	Link 305 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2823	P03	Link 501 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2824	P03	Link 502 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2825	P03	Link 503 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2826	P03	Link 504 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2827	P04	Link 505 Long-Sections	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2829	P03	Link 507 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2830	P03	Link 508 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2831	P03	Link 509 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2832	P03	Link 510 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2833	P02	Link 511 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2834	P02	Link 512 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2835	P02	Link 601 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2836	P02	BMX Track Private Access Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2838	P02	Tongwell Street Car Park Access Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2840	P02	Willen Link Roundabout Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2841	P02	A509 Roundabout 1 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2842	P02	Eastern link Roundabout 1 long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2843	P02	A509 Roundabout 2 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2844	P02	Eastern Link Roundabout 2 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2845	P02	Cranfield Link Roundabout Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2846	P02	Eastern Link Roundabout 3 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2847	P02	Eastern Link Roundabout 4 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2848	P02	Existing Pumping Station Access Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2849	P01	Link 104 - A509 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2850	P01	A509 Dual Carriageway Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2851	P01	A509 - Link 104 Long-Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2860	P01	Link 109 Northbound Long Section	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-2861	P01	Link 109 Southbound Long Section	10/09/2021
<b>Bridges &amp; Structures Drawings</b>			
MKE-WSP-CBR-ZZ-DR-BR-002	P06	Highway Structures Location Plan	10/09/2021

Drawing Number	Rev.	Title	Received date
MKE-WSP-CBR-M1B-DR-BR-001	P05	M1 Milton Keynes East Bridge Sheet 1	
MKE-WSP-CBR-M1B-DR-BR-002	P01	M1 Milton Keynes East Bridge Sheet 2	
MKE-WSP-CBR-TSN-DR-BR-001	P07	Tongwell Street Northbound Bridge	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-CBR-VR2-DR-BR-001	P02	Tongwell Street Link Structures Sheet 1	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-CBR-VR2-DR-BR-002	P02	Tongwell Street Link Structures Sheet 2	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-CBR-VR2-DR-BR-003	P02	Tongwell Street Link Structures Sheet 3	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-CBR-VR2-DR-BR-004	P02	Tongwell Street Link Structures Sheet 4	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-CBR-ROF-DR-BR-001	P04	River Ouzel Floodplain Bridge	
MKE-WSP-CBR-MSB-DR-BR-001	P03	Moulsoe Stream Bridge	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-CBR-SW2-DR-BR-001	P01	MKE Subway 2	
MKE-WSP-CBR-SW457-DR-BR-001	P01	MKE Subways 4, 5 & 7 Sheet 1	
MKE-WSP-CBR-SW457-DR-BR-002	P01	MKE Subways 4, 5 & 7 Sheet 2	
MKE-WSP-CBR-SW8-DR-BR-001	P01	MKE Subway 8	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-CBR-FR-DR-BR-001	P02	Flood Relief Culverts 1 & 2	
MKE-WSP-CBR-C3-DR-BR-001	P02	MKE Culvert 3	
<b>Drainage Drawings</b>			
Headwall Type A	P01	Headwall Type A	
Headwall Type B	P01	Headwall Type B	
Headwall Type C	P01	Headwall Type C	
Headwall Type D	P01	Headwall Type D	
Headwall Type E	P01	Headwall Type E	
Headwall Type F	P01	Headwall Type F	
Headwall Type G	P01	Headwall Type G	
Headwall Type H	P01	Headwall Type H	
MCHW Construction Details	P01	MCHW Construction Standard Details	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0540	P01	Pond 1 Long Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0542	P01	Pond 2 Long Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0543	P01	Pond 3 Long sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0544	P01	Pond 5 Long Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0545	P01	Pond 9 Long Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0546	P01	Pond 14 Long Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0547	P01	Pond 15 Long Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0548	P01	Pond 16 Long Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0549	P01	Pond 18A-1 Long Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0550	P01	Pond 18A-2 Long Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0551	P01	Pond 18A-3 Long Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0552	P01	Pond 22 Long Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0553	P01	Pond 25 Long Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0554	P01	Pond 26 Long Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0555	P01	Pond 27A Long Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0556	P01	Pond 27B Long Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0500	P01	Tongwell Street Impermeable Area Plan	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0501	P02	Drainage Plan sheet 1	10/09/2021

<b>Drawing Number</b>	<b>Rev.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Received date</b>
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0502	P02	Drainage Plan sheet 2	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0503	P02	Drainage Plan sheet 3	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0504	P02	Drainage Plan sheet 4	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0505	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 5	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0506	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 6	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0507	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 7	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0508	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 8	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0509	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 9	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0510	P02	Drainage Plan sheet 10	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0511	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 11	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0512	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 12	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0513	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 13	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0514	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 14	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0515	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 15	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0516	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 16	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0517	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 17	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0518	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 18	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0519	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 19	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0520	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 20	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0521	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 21	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0522	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 22	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0523	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 23	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0524	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 24	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0525	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 25	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0526	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 26	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0527	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 27	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0528	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 28	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0529	P02	Drainage Plan sheet 29	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0530	P02	Drainage Plan sheet 30	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0531	P02	Drainage Plan sheet 31	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0532	P02	Drainage Plan sheet 32	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0533	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 33	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0534	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 34	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0535	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 35	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0536	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 36	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0537	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 37	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0538	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 38	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0539	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 39	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0540	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 40	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0541	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 41	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0542	P01	Drainage Plan sheet 42	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0594	P02	Drainage Typical Cross Sections	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 1	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 1	



<b>Drawing Number</b>	<b>Rev.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Received date</b>
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 2	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 2	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 3	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 3	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 4	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 4	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 5	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 5	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 6	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 6	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 7	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 7	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 8	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 8	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 9	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 9	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 10	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 10	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 11	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 11	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 12	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 12	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 13	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 13	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 14	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 14	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 15	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 15	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 16	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 16	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 17	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 17	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 18	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 18	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 19	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 19	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 20	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 20	
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-SK-0520-0530 -Sheet 21	P01	Drainage Long Section – Sheet 21	
<b>Drainage Strategy Drawings</b>			
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0591-P03	P03	Proposed Catchment Plan	10/09/2021
MKE-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-C-DR-0592-P03	P03	Outline Integrated Drainage Strategy	10/09/2021
Plan xx		Strategic Highway Infrastructure	01/10/2021

2. The development subject of the full planning permission hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

3. In respect of the areas of the site subject to the outline permission hereby permitted, applications for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before expiration of twenty-two years from the date of this permission. The development thereby permitted shall be begun no later than the expiration of three years from the date of the approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
4. Details of the access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping (hereinafter called 'the reserved matters') for each phase of the development hereby permitted in outline shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the commencement of any development on that phase. The development shall be carried out as approved.
5. Prior to the submission of any reserved matters applications for the delivery of homes, community, employment or commercial floorspace or large areas of landscaping, a strategic site-wide Design Code shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
6. Prior to the submission of the first reserved matters application on each phase involving the delivery of homes, community, employment or commercial floorspace or large areas of landscaping, a Design Code for that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

#### Limits of permission

7. The development hereby permitted shall provide a minimum of 4,000 and maximum of 4,600 homes.
8. The non-residential development hereby permitted shall be limited to the maximum floorspace as set out below:

Use/ Component	Location(s) Within Site	Use Class & Use Type	Maximum Amount
Employment	Employment Areas Plus 3 x employment or residential parcels to west of River Ouzel.	Use Class B2/B8 Use Class E (Offices/Light Industrial)	403,650 sqm of which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum 37,160 sqm Class E offices/light industrial</li> <li>• Maximum 92,900 sqm Class B2 industrial</li> <li>• Maximum 403,650 sqm Class B8 warehousing (with ancillary offices)</li> </ul>
Schools	3 x Primary Schools 1 x Secondary School	Use Class F1	PS1: 3 Form of Entry (3.0ha site) PS2: 3 Form of Entry (3.0ha site) PS3: 2 Form of Entry (2.1ha site) SS1: Up to 10 Form of Entry (11.8ha site)
Commercial and Community	Community Hub	Commercial use within Class E/Sui Generis including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shops, restaurants, cafes, services (uses in</li> </ul>	10,000 sqm Class E/Sui Generis floorspace in the community hub of which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum 4,000 sqm retail</li> <li>• Maximum 2,000 sqm health</li> </ul>

Use/ Component	Location(s) Within Site	Use Class & Use Type	Maximum Amount
		Class E) and public house, takeaway (uses in Sui Generis class) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health centre</li> <li>• Early years nursery</li> <li>• Gymnasium</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum 2,000 sqm early years nursery</li> <li>• Maximum 1,000 sqm commercial gym</li> <li>• Maximum 2,000 sqm office use (within maximum 37,160 sqm offices/light industrial across entire site).</li> </ul>
		Community hall and/or community services within Use Class F1/F2	400 sqm
	South of Moulsoe Local Parade	Use Class E/Sui Generis – shops, restaurants, cafes, services (uses in Class E) and takeaway (Sui Generis)	500 sqm Class E/Sui Generis floorspace
	Sports Pitches	Sports pavilion/clubhouse within Use Class F2	600 sqm
	Linear/District Park	Community building/visitor centre within Use Class F2	600 sqm

9. No development, except for works of demolition, site preparation and enabling, site clearance or approved ecological mitigation works, shall commence until a site-wide Phasing Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Phasing Plan shall include the proposed programme and sequence for providing the following:
- the order of residential parcels, and the order of the development within those parcels, including works associated with that parcel;
  - the order of non-residential parcels and development, and the order of the development within those parcels, including works associated with that parcel;
  - all highways works, including public and private highways including footways, cycleways, redways, parking and street lighting;
  - sustainable drainage systems and associated infrastructure;
  - open space including play areas and pedestrian circulation areas; and
  - any off-site works required under this permission, a planning obligation or agreement under the Highway Act 1980.

The details shall be provided with reference to the extent and location of individual development phases or sub-phases and any associated interim access, drainage, groundworks or boundary treatment arrangements.

Where the 'flexible' use parcels, as defined by the approved Land Use Parameter Plan as 'Employment or residential including homes for the elderly' (shown immediately north of the new M1 crossing) are proposed as residential, full justification for the end use(s), including a noise impact assessment to include all noise sources relative to the proposed end user(s) on and immediately adjacent to the parcel(s), shall be provided as part of the site-wide Phasing Plan.

Where changes to the approved phasing programme are required in order to adjust the strategy for the delivery of the site as a whole, a revised Phasing Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the latest approved programme.

### Housing

10. All reserved matters applications relating to residential development shall be accompanied by an updated accommodation schedule, setting out the type, size, tenure, accessibility and adaptability of each plot in the phase, as well as a cumulative total based on previous permissions. Plot numbers shall be consistent from one version to the next to ensure each plot can be individually identified across the lifetime of the development. The housing mix for the overall scheme shall be provided in general accordance with the Total Housing Mix (Market and Affordable) set out on Page 8 of the submitted Affordable Housing Statement (dated October 2021).
11. Prior to the commencement of the 250<sup>th</sup> residential unit, a scheme for the provision of a minimum of 0.8 hectares of land for self-build housing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Scheme shall include:
  - A plan of the location(s) of the site(s);
  - A plan for the division of plots;
  - Evidence and strategy for the servicing and access to the plots;
  - Marketing strategy for the delivery of the plots; and
  - Strategy and timeframes for delivery.

The scheme shall be delivered as approved.

If an appropriate amount of self-build housing land has been provided or is to be provided elsewhere within the wider MK East allocation then evidence of this shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in lieu of a Scheme.

### Employment, retail and other uses

12. At no time shall mezzanine floorspace be constructed in any employment uses without the express grant of permission from the Local Planning Authority.
13. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, or any statutory instrument amending, revoking and/or replacing that Order, at no time shall any non-residential floorspace within the areas designated as employment land on the approved plans, be used as a retail shop, café, restaurant or other service without the prior grant of planning permission pursuant to an application made to the Local Planning Authority in that regard..

Reason: To prevent the provision of an out of town retail centre or leisure park, which could be detrimental to the viability of nearby retail centres.

14. Prior to the occupation of any retail or service floorspace, a phasing and occupation plan for the delivery of the retail and service units shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.
15. All reserved matters applications relating to retail and service units shall be accompanied by a scheme for the locations of sui generis uses such as, but not limited to, hot food takeaways, and their location and proximity to sensitive uses such as, but not limited to, schools. All uses of this type shall be positioned away from sensitive uses in accordance with adopted local planning policy or supplementary planning guidance at the time of the application.
16. Prior to the occupation of any unit requiring ventilation/extraction, a scheme for the method of extraction/ventilation, including management and maintenance of equipment required, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.
17. All reserved matters applications relating to the provision of schools shall be accompanied by a community use scheme, setting out how the facility and/or associated playing pitches along with their operating organisation will support wider community use outside of operational school hours.

#### Highways

18. The development subject of the full planning permission hereby permitted shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved general arrangement shown on 'Plan xx - Strategic Highway Infrastructure'.
19. The Strategic Highway Infrastructure hereby approved shall be implemented and brought into use prior to occupation of the 250<sup>th</sup> home.  
Reason: To ensure that the Strategic Highway Infrastructure adequately mitigates the impacts of the development on the Strategic Road Network in the interests of highway safety.
20. Traffic surveys at junction 14 of the M1 motorway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with National Highways Limited or equivalent organisation) within 12 months of the approved Strategic Highway Infrastructure being implemented and brought into public use. The proposed scope, methodology and specification for the Traffic Surveys shall be first agreed with the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with National Highways Limited or equivalent organisation) prior to them being undertaken.
21. Revised transport modelling at junction 14 of the M1 motorway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with National Highways Limited or equivalent organisation) within 12 months of the approved Strategic Highway Infrastructure being implemented

and brought into public use. The revised transport modelling shall include but not be limited to:

- revised traffic data to update the Paramics Model of M1 J14 to re-create a new Existing Baseline Model scenario and an updated 2031 Planning Test scenario;
- assessment of the M1 J14 post opening of the Strategic Highway Infrastructure shown on 'Plan xx- Strategic Highway Infrastructure'; and
- if required, highway improvement scheme/schemes (DMRB compliant) to mitigate any resulting highway safety critical impacts of the development.

Reason: To ensure the safe operation of this part of the strategic highway network, to evaluate the effectiveness of the Strategic Highway Infrastructure at mitigating the impacts of the development on the Strategic Road Network and in the interests of highway safety.

22. No part of the highways infrastructure works hereby permitted except for any works of demolition, site preparation and enabling, site clearance or approved ecological mitigation works, shall be commenced until such time as detailed drawings of the layout and construction of the approved works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
23. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, an access scheme relating to the affected Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme shall include provision for:
  - a) the design of access and PRoW routes and their surfacing, widths, gradients, landscaping and structures; and
  - b) any proposals for diversion and/or closure of PRoWs and alternative route provision.
24. All reserved matters applications involving the provision of car parking shall include electric vehicle charging points, or provision for any subsequent technology, as required by adopted local planning policy or supplementary planning guidance at the time of the application.
25. All reserved matters applications shall include provision for the parking of bicycles and any other non-car related parking provision as required by adopted local planning policy or supplementary planning guidance at the time of the application.
26. Prior to the occupation of any non-residential unit a delivery management scheme for that unit shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The unit shall then be operated in accordance with the approved scheme.

### Construction

27. No development of the highways infrastructure works hereby permitted, including any works of demolition, shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include site procedures to be adopted during the course of construction including:
- (a) routes for construction traffic;
  - (b) method of prevention of mud being carried onto the highway;
  - (c) location of site compound(s) and/or consolidation area(s);
  - (d) methods for suppressing dust;
  - (e) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
  - (f) the erection and maintenance of security fencing/hoardings and lighting;
  - (g) proposed temporary traffic restrictions;
  - (h) parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
  - (i) protection of ecological receptors and protected species; and
  - (j) protection of retained habitats from loss and degradation.
- The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved CEMP.
28. All reserved matters applications shall be accompanied by a parcel-specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) taking into account the proposed development parcel and any adjacent parcels. The parcel-specific CEMP shall include site procedures to be adopted during the course of construction including:
- (a) routes for construction traffic;
  - (b) method of prevention of mud being carried onto the highway;
  - (c) location of site compound;
  - (d) methods for suppressing dust;
  - (e) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
  - (f) the erection and maintenance of security fencing/hoardings and lighting;
  - (g) proposed temporary traffic restrictions;
  - (h) parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
  - (i) protection of ecological receptors and protected species;
  - (j) protection of retained habitats from loss and degradation.
29. No development hereby permitted shall take place until a strategy for the reuse of soils and extracted material on site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall identify the quality of material to be reused, how and where it will be stored, and its proposed use within site. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved strategy.
30. No development of the highways infrastructure works hereby permitted, including any works of demolition, shall take place until a site-wide Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved SWMP.

31. All reserved matters applications shall be accompanied by a parcel-specific Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) taking into account the proposed development parcel and any adjacent parcels.
32. No development hereby permitted shall commence on any phase until full details of the noise barriers/acoustic fencing for that phase have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include precise locations, in accordance with the broad locations shown on the approved plans, height, detail, materials, colour and construction. The fencing shall be installed on the relevant phase, prior to commencement of any works on that phase.

#### Contamination

33. Prior to commencement of the highways infrastructure works hereby permitted an assessment of ground conditions to determine the likelihood of any ground, groundwater or gas contamination within the highways infrastructure areas of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The results of this survey shall detail the nature and extent of any contamination, together with a strategy for any remedial action deemed necessary to bring the site to a condition suitable for its intended use. Any remedial works shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved strategy.
34. All reserved matters applications shall be accompanied by an assessment of ground conditions to determine the likelihood of any ground, groundwater or gas contamination within that phase or sub-phase of the site. The results of this survey shall detail the nature and extent of any contamination, together with a strategy for any remedial action deemed necessary to bring the site to a condition suitable for its intended use. Any remedial works shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved strategy.
35. Prior to the first occupation of each respective unit or dwelling, or groups of units of dwellings, hereby permitted, a contamination verification report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
36. Should any unforeseen contamination be encountered during development works shall cease immediately in the affected area and the Local Planning Authority shall be immediately informed in writing, whereafter a survey detailing the nature and extent of any contamination, together with a strategy for any remedial action deemed necessary to bring the site to a condition suitable for its intended use, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to works recommencing on the affected part of the site



Reason: To ensure that the site is fit for its proposed purposes and any potential risks to human health, property, and the natural and historical environment, are appropriately investigated and minimised.

### Archaeology

37. Prior to the commencement of each phase of the development a programme of archaeological field evaluation comprising geophysical survey and/or trial trenching for that phase shall be completed. The programme of archaeological evaluation shall be detailed in a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

On completion of the agreed archaeological field evaluation for each phase a further WSI for a programme of archaeological mitigation in respect of any identified areas of significant buried archaeological remains shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme for archaeological mitigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions, and:

1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording;
2. The programme for post investigation assessment;
3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording;
4. Provision to be made for a programme of public engagement and outreach;
5. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation in both popular and academic formats;
6. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation; and
7. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the WSI.

No development in any phase shall take place other than in accordance with the WSI so approved. The development permitted by that phase shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the approved WSI and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

38. No development shall commence on each relevant phase until a plan for the fencing of any areas of archaeological investigations has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include the locations, design of the fencing and a programme for the retention of the fencing on site. The fencing shall be installed in accordance with the plan prior to the commencement of any development. No works shall take place within the area inside that fencing unless first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

### Ecology and landscaping

39. All existing trees, woodlands and hedges that are to be retained on and adjacent to the site shall be protected according to the provisions of BS 5837: 2012 'Trees

in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations.' All protective measures, including the fencing and ground protection, must be put in place first, prior to any other work commencing on each relevant phase (this includes vegetation clearance, ground-works, vehicle movements, machinery / materials delivery etc.) and shall thereafter be maintained in place in good functional condition until the development of that phase is entirely complete and until, with the exception of soft landscaping works, all contractors, equipment and materials have left the site.

Once erected, the Local Authority Tree Officer shall be notified so the fencing can be inspected and approved. The Root Protection Area (RPA) within the protective fencing must be kept free of all construction, construction plant, machinery, personnel, digging and scraping, service runs, water-logging, changes in level, building materials and all other operations, personnel, structures, tools, storage and materials, for the duration of the construction phase.

40. Prior to commencement of the highways infrastructure works hereby permitted an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS), in accordance with BS 5837:2012 (or any equivalent British Standard that may replace it) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The AMS shall include full details of the removal methodology to transplant existing mature trees where feasible and evidence that the best hedgerow is being retained and protected during construction and operation. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved AMS.
41. All reserved matters applications affecting existing trees or hedgerow shall be accompanied by an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) in accordance with BS 5837:2012 (or any equivalent British Standard that may replace it). The AMS shall evidence that the best hedgerow is being retained and protected during construction and operation.
42. All reserved matters applications shall be accompanied by up to date phase 2 protected species surveys relevant to that phase. No survey shall be more than two years old as of the date of the application submission unless it can be otherwise demonstrated to remain relevant/valid and shall ideally be carried out in the survey season immediately prior to the submission of the application.
43. Prior to the installation of any lighting in relation to the highways infrastructure works hereby permitted a detailed lighting assessment and scheme for lighting, which takes into account biodiversity and habitat features, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any lighting shall be installed only in accordance with the approved details.
44. Prior to the installation of services and setting out of roads, cycleways, redways and footways details of the landscaping scheme in relation to the highways infrastructure works hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The landscaping shall include full details of the tree, shrub and other planting for each phase of the highway infrastructure works, including full details of proposals to transplant existing mature trees where feasible, proposed finished ground levels and all boundary treatments.

The landscaping scheme shall be implemented in full in the first planting season following completion of the highway works.

Any trees or shrub failing to thrive within five years of planting (ten years in the case of trees) shall be replaced on site in accordance with the original planting specification.

45. All reserved matters applications shall be accompanied by details of the proposed finished ground and floor levels for the relevant phase in relation to existing site levels and existing levels at surrounding sites.
46. Prior to the first public use of the highway infrastructure works hereby permitted a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy (BES) and Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These plans shall include, as a minimum, the following:
  - details of the protection of ecological receptors;
  - plans for mitigation and compensation, based on recommendations outlined in Chapter Q of the Environmental Statement provided in support of this development;
  - detailed compensation for the loss of any trees identified as potentially veteran; and
  - an updated Biodiversity Impact Assessment Metric showing a net gain at the site.
47. All reserved matters applications shall be accompanied by a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy (BES) and Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP). These plans shall include, as a minimum, the following:
  - details of the protection of ecological receptors;
  - detailed lighting assessment and scheme for lighting, which takes into account biodiversity and habitat features;
  - plans for mitigation and compensation, based on recommendations outlined in Chapter Q of the Environmental Statement provided in support of this development;
  - detailed compensation for the loss of any trees identified as potentially veteran; and
  - an updated Biodiversity Impact Assessment Metric showing a net gain at the site.
48. Prior to the development of land which is presently under agricultural use a farmland bird compensation strategy, to include details of the provision of appropriate habitat for farmland birds off site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

49. Prior to the first public use of the highway infrastructure works hereby permitted a Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan (LMMP) for the highway infrastructure corridors shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:
- a) landscape design and management plans to support a written document;
  - b) a conveyance style plan showing the division of responsibility for the areas of public amenity space, areas to be privately managed as communal amenity or incidental space, and areas proposed to be adopted by highways;
  - c) the open space specification of maintenance and management operations appropriate over the short, medium and long-term in perpetuity; and
  - d) specify who will be taking on management and maintenance responsibilities for all open space, public amenity and communal greenspace.
50. All reserved matters applications relating to landscaping shall be accompanied by a Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan (LMMP) for that relevant phase. The scheme shall include:
- a) landscape design and management plans to support a written document;
  - b) a conveyance style plan showing the division of responsibility for the areas of public amenity space, areas to be privately managed as communal amenity or incidental space, areas proposed to be adopted by highways as street landscaping and those areas of private garden amenity space;
  - c) the open space specification of maintenance and management operations appropriate over the short, medium and long-term in perpetuity (except where relating to privately owned residential dwellings); and
  - d) specify who will be taking on management and maintenance responsibilities for all open space, public amenity and communal greenspace.

#### Drainage

51. The development hereby permitted, excluding site clearance and demolition works, must not be commenced until such time as a scheme to finalise the Moulsoe Brook flood model has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained in accordance with the scheme's timing/phasing arrangements.
52. No development of a phase or sub-phase, including preparatory works, shall commence until details of measures to capture and control surface water run-off from the relevant phase will be provided and managed during the construction works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The applicant may be required to provide collection, balancing and/or settlement systems for these flows, and should include the maintenance proposals during construction works. The approved measures and systems shall be brought into operation before any works to create buildings or hard surfaces commence.

53. Prior to the installation of services and setting out of roads, cycleways, redways and footways of the highways works hereby permitted a surface water drainage scheme, based on sustainable drainage principles, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be subsequently implemented in full accordance with the approved details prior to the first use of the the respective surface it drains. The scheme shall be based upon the principles within the agreed Surface Water Drainage Technical Note, prepared by WSP, revision 3, dated 9 July 2021 and shall also include:
- a) Full calculations detailing the existing surface water runoff rates for the QBAR, 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 30) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) storm events;
  - b) Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the above referenced storm events (as well as 1% AEP plus climate change), inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements and including an allowance for urban creep, together with an assessment of system performance;
  - c) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions, pipe reference numbers and locations of appropriate signage;
  - d) Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures;
  - e) Site investigation and test results to confirm infiltration rates;
  - f) Temporary storage facilities if the development is to be phased;
  - g) A timetable for implementation if the development is to be phased;
  - h) Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site without increasing flood risk to occupants;
  - i) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system; and
  - j) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water.
54. Prior to the first public use of the highways works hereby permitted, details for the long term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details should identify runoff sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structures, flow routes and outfalls. In addition, the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes. The maintenance plan shall be carried out in full thereafter.
55. All reserved matters applications for layout shall be accompanied by a detailed surface water strategy. The strategy shall accord with the approved details of the strategic site wide surface water strategy. The strategy shall be based upon a SuDS hierarchy, as espoused by the publication 'The SuDS Manual CIRIA C753'. The strategy shall maximise the use of measures to control water at source as far as practicable to limit the rate and quantity of run-off and improve the quality of any run-off before it leaves the site or joins any water body.

The strategy shall include details of all flow control system and the design, location and capacity of all strategic SuDS features and shall include ownership, long-term adoption, management and maintenance schemes, and monitoring arrangements/responsibilities including appropriate signage. The strategy should also demonstrate that the exceedance of the designed system has been considered through the provision of overland flow routes.

The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details and no building pursuant to that particular reserved matters site for which approval is being sought shall be occupied or used until such time as the approved detailed surface water measures have been fully completed in accordance with the approved details.

56. Any reserved matters applications or approval of details reserved by condition shall utilise the Parcel Pro-Forma template (as per Appendix G within the agreed Surface Water Drainage Technical Note, prepared by WSP, revision 3, dated 9 July 2021) to demonstrate water catchment compliance of drainage and water infrastructure in accordance with the principles established within the site wide strategy and any relevant supplements. It shall include an updated summary of the allowable and proposed contributing impermeable areas per parcel to ensure that approved percentages have not been exceeded.
57. All reserved matters applications that include buildings shall include a scheme for on-site foul water drainage works, including connection points and discharge rates. Prior to the occupation of any phase, the foul water drainage works relating to that phase shall carried out in complete accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding

58. Upon completion of the surface water drainage system, including any attenuation ponds and swales, and prior to their adoption by a statutory undertaker or management company; a survey and report from an independent surveyor shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The survey and report shall be carried out by an appropriately qualified Chartered Surveyor or Chartered Engineer and demonstrate that the surface water drainage system has been constructed in accordance with the details approved pursuant to Conditions 56 to 58. Where necessary, details of corrective works to be carried out along with a timetable for their completion shall be included for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any corrective works required shall be carried out in accordance with the approved timetable and subsequently re-surveyed by an independent surveyor, with their findings submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

#### Sustainability

59. All reserved matters applications involving provision of buildings shall be accompanied by a Sustainability Statement and/or Energy and Climate

Statement, as appropriate, to accord with adopted local planning policy and supplementary planning guidance regarding sustainability, energy efficiency, renewable energy generation and carbon offsetting.

Reason: To ensure the future sustainability and energy efficiency of the development.

60. All reserved matters applications involving provision of buildings shall be accompanied by a proposed strategy for a quality and monitoring regime in relation to energy use, carbon emissions, indoor air quality, and overheating risk. Upon their completion, all output reports from the monitoring regimes shall be sent to the applicable owners/occupiers of the monitored dwellings and shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the building performance of completed dwellings matches their calculated design performance, and that any gaps in performance are identified and reported.

#### Other

61. All reserved matters applications involving provision of buildings shall be accompanied by a strategy for the delivery of infrastructure which, at a minimum, is capable of providing superfast broadband connections (defined as providing broadband infrastructure capable of meeting speeds in excess of 30 megabits/second) or in accordance with the requirements of adopted local planning policy and supplementary planning guidance.
62. No overhead wires or cables shall be installed as part of the development hereby permitted unless related to the provision of replacement, or diversion of, existing overhead wires or cables. If overhead diversions or replacements are required these should be replaced or diverted underground where possible.
63. All reserved matters applications shall be accompanied by evidence to demonstrate how the proposal accords, in so far as is practicable, with Secured by Design (or any subsequent regime promoted by the emergency services with regards to safety and security).
64. All reserved matters applications involving the provision of buildings shall be accompanied a waste management plan detailing how waste and recycling will be stored and collected at/from dwellings and/or non-residential units.